This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

~~S~~
(~~Long~~)
~~1906~~

3d. Jan. 1909.

C
Brown, R

LIBRARY

OF THE

DIVINITY SCHOOL.

Transferred from
Harvard College Library.
31 Oct. 1906.

349

THE TRUE STORY

OF

ROBERT BROWNE

(1550?–1633)

FATHER OF CONGREGATIONALISM

INCLUDING VARIOUS POINTS HITHERTO UNKNOWN OR MISUNDERSTOOD, WITH SOME ACCOUNT OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIS RELIGIOUS VIEWS, AND AN EXTENDED AND IMPROVED LIST OF HIS WRITINGS

BY

CHAMPLIN BURRAGE, M.A. (BROWN UNIVERSITY)

RESEARCH FELLOW OF NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION

OXFORD
PRINTED BY HORACE HART
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: PUBLISHED BY HENRY FROWDE
1906

So
(Comp.)
1906

Bd. Jan. 1909.

C
Browne, R.

LIBRARY

OF THE

DIVINITY SCHOOL.

Transferred from
Harvard College Library.
31 Oct. 1906.

cannot be relied on for chronological accuracy, and should be used only after the most unsparing criticism. This remark also applies to the work of all those who have followed the statements of these earlier authors, and thus the writer himself is compelled to correct some of his own views elsewhere expressed.

In the preparation of these pages he is greatly indebted to the Rev. F. Ives Cater, of Oundle, for the loan of his admirable paper entitled 'New Facts Relating to Robert Browne', recently printed in the 'Transactions' of the Congregational Historical Society for January, 1906. This is the most suggestive contribution concerning Browne that has appeared for a long time, and has enabled the writer to complete his study of Browne's life. He is also especially grateful to Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet, Professor of Church History in Mansfield College, Oxford, for a thorough and critical examination of the contents of the following pages, whereby very considerable improvement has been secured.

This pamphlet, it may be said, is not published for religious controversial purposes, but rather as a supplement to, and corrective of, Dr. Henry Martyn Dexter's account of Robert Browne's life. It is also intended as a companion work to Dr. Dexter's little volume, entitled 'The True Story of John Smyth, the Se-Baptist'; and it is no small pleasure for one who has benefited much by Congregational learning, to be able herewith to present to the Congregationalists of America and England the following 'True Story' of their historical father or pioneer. The writer unfortunately has not been able to adorn this pamphlet with a likeness of Robert Browne, though he wishes he might have done so. Browne certainly deserves a portrait, for the history of New England may be said really to begin with him, in the religious ideas which he promulgated. Those who have said that Browne was not made of the stuff of which martyrs are made, have at least not spoken the whole truth. A martyr does not need necessarily to be hanged or to be burned at the stake. In some respects Browne was certainly more of a martyr than Barrowe, Greenwood, or Penry. The authorities ruined his life just as much

as they did theirs. Their penalty was quickly executed; but Browne was practically allowed to die for forty years, before he was trundled off to Northampton Gaol. Robert Browne has sometimes been looked upon as a coward and an apostate. This is certainly too harsh judgement, for in reality he was a singularly honest and an unusually brave man, as becomes more and more apparent the better he is understood.

To the librarians and other officials of the many English libraries which have been visited in the preparation of this work, and which are almost too numerous here to record by name, the writer hereby extends his very hearty thanks for the many favours he has received at their hands. Among those who have been exceptionally kind to him while engaged in these researches, he would especially mention: the Rev. Sadler Phillips, Hon. Secretary of the Church Historical Society; Mr. S. Wayland Kershaw, M.A., Librarian of Lambeth Palace Library, London; Mr. Falconer Madan, M.A., Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian Library, and Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford; Mr. Rushbrooke, Head Master of St. Olave's Grammar School, Southwark; Mr. Francis J. H. Jenkinson, M.A., Librarian of the University Library, Cambridge; Mr. Charles W. Moule, M.A., Senior Fellow and Librarian of Corpus Christi College; Professor J. S. Reid, D.Litt., Librarian of Gonville and Caius College; Mr. Arthur Gray, M.A., Tutor of Jesus College; Mr. E. W. Lockhart, Sub-Librarian of St. John's College; Mr. James D. H. Dickson, M.A., F.R.S.E., Fellow of Peterhouse; Rev. Robert Sinker, D.D., Librarian, and Mr. William White, Sub-Librarian, of Trinity College, Cambridge; Mr. John A. Herbert, B.A., Superintendent of the Manuscript Reading Room in the British Museum; Mr. George K. Fortescue, Keeper of the Printed Books in the British Museum; Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, K.C.B., &c., &c., Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum; the Bishops of Norwich and London; the Archbishop of Canterbury; and his Excellency, the Hon. Whitelaw Reid, Ambassador of the United States of America.

C. B.

OXFORD, *April* 25, 1906.

'But as I judge it to be the noblest occupation to gaze on the truth, so it is the greatest dishonour to accept falsities for truths.'

(*The Academics of Cicero* as translated by Prof. J. S. Reid, Litt.D., p. 57, sect. 66.)

CHAPTER I

THE PERIOD OF EDUCATION AND NONCONFORMITY (1568?—Oct. 7, 1585).

I. The Years spent in England successively as Student, Teacher, Preacher, and Organizer of a Separatist Church (1568?—Jan. 1581/2?[1]).

From the time of Thomas Fuller it has been the custom of those who have made a study of Robert Browne's life to give considerable emphasis to the important standing of the Browne family. The point of view, however, taken by later Congregational scholars in speaking of Browne in relation to his notable ancestry, is naturally somewhat different from that adopted by the earlier writers. Fuller seems rather to suggest a contrast between the 'ancient and worshipfull family' and Robert (styled by Bredwell 'Troublechurch') Browne, and to seek to make it appear strange that so great a family could produce such a disturber of the Church's peace. Congregational scholars, however, refer with pride to the same 'ancient and worshipfull family', to show that the father of Congregationalism came from stock of more than ordinary reputation. To the present writer further attention to the Browne family appears unnecessary. Those who delight in genealogical lore may go to Dr. Dexter's account of Browne's life, or to Mr. Cater's admirable article on 'Robert Browne's Ancestors and Descendants'.[2] It is sufficient for us to know that Browne came of a highly respectable family of even honourable position, and that Robert also, if he had early

[1] The dates of the years throughout these pages, unless within quotation marks, are given both in Old and New Style. The dates of the month always given in Old Style.

[2] In the 'Transactions' of the Congregational Historical Society for September, 1905 (vol. ii, no. 3), pp. 151–9.

chosen to follow the ways of the world, might himself have been highly honoured. In time, too, it seems reasonable to believe that he will have his honours, or at any rate become better known to the world of to-day than any other member of his 'ancient and worshipfull family'.

Robert was the third son of Anthony Browne, who was 'born at Tolethorpe in 1515', and 'was sheriff of Rutlandshire' in 1546, 1558, and 1571'.[1] He was born probably about 1550, but at present no record of the date of his birth is known. Of his early life also we know practically nothing, except that he had been 'brought vp in schooles, & in the Vniuersitie of Cambridge'[2], where as a graduate of Corpus Christi College, 'being placed 18th in the list,' he took the degree of B.A. in 1572.[3] While in the University he was apparently 'knovvne & counted forvvard in religion'.[4] After taking his degree it is possible that he remained in Cambridge for some time, and even then he evidently 'suffered some trouble' for his advanced views.[5] About 1575 he seems to have begun 'to teach schollers'[6], probably because he did not feel justified in taking orders. There appears to be no good reason to believe that Browne taught during this period in London. More probably at this time he was teacher at some small place like Stamford, where family influence would have given him a good position. Here he remained 'for the space of three yeares . . . hauing a special care to teach religion vvith other learning'.[7] In this work he seems to have had success and to have kept 'his schollers in such avve & good order, as all the Tounsemē vvhere he taught gaue him vvitnes'.[8] Yet he was not content, for as he noticed the great faults of the times and brooded over them, 'he fell into great care, & was soare greeued vvhile he long considered manie thinges amisse, & the cause of all, to be the vvofull and lamētable state off

[1] 'Robert Browne's Ancestors and Descendants,' as above, p. 154.
[2] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A recto.
[3] Browne entered Corpus in 1570.
[4] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A.
[5] Ibid. Sig. A. [6] Ibid. [7] Ibid.
[8] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A.

the church. Wherefore he laboured much to knovve his duetie in such thīges, . . . & night & day did consult vvith him selfe & others about thē, least he should be ignorant, or mistake anie off those matters.' Browne now began to express his views both to his pupils and to 'those of the tovvne vvith vvhome he kept companie'.[1] But this conscientiousness only 'got hī much enuie of the preacher & sōe others vvhere he taught, & much trouble also vvhē he broke his mīd more plainlie vnto thē. Presētlie after this he vvas discharged of his schole by the grudge of his enimies. Yet he taught still, vvith great good Vvill & fauour of the Tounsemē, till such time as the plague increased in the Tovvne . . .'.[2] This was probably in the summer of 1578, and being requested to come home, Browne 'gaue vvarning to the Toune' and returned to Tolethorpe, where possibly he may have remained for as much as half a year; but apparently becoming restless at this inactive life, 'he asked leaue of his father, & tooke his Iournie to Cābridge frō vvhēse a fevv yeares before he had departed,'[3] and where evidently he hoped to be more successful in the work of advancing a reformation in the Church of England.

Arriving in Cambridge apparently about January, 1578/9, he seems soon to have sought out Mr. Richard Greenham, of Dry Drayton, a clergyman of Presbyterian inclinations, 'vvhōe of all others he hard sai vvas moste forvvarde'.[4] Browne soon came to live in his house, and 'vvas suffered, as others also in his his [*sic*] house, to speake of that part of scripture, Vvhich vvas vsed to be red after meales. And although he [Greenham] said, that vvithout leaue & special vvord from the bishop, he vvas to suffer none to teach openlie in his parish, yet Vvithout anie such leaue he suffered R. B.'[5], doubtless because he knew that Burghley, the Lord Treasurer of the realm, and Chancellor of the University, was Browne's kinsman. Robert had not been long in the neighbourhood 'vvhen certaine in Cambrige . . boath moued him, & also vvith consent of the Maior & Vice-chancelar, called him

[1] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A recto and verso.
[2] Ibid. Sig. A verso.
[3] Ibid. Sig. A verso.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.

to preach among them,'[1] being at this time clearly of Presbyterian inclination, like his teacher, Richard Greenham. Browne, however, hesitated to accept this invitation, because he saw that he would be compelled to be ordained or licensed by a bishop; and this fact brought him face to face with the question as to whether ordination, or even licensing, by a bishop could be tolerated by him, and after much thought and conference he decided in the negative, as he states in the following citations:—

'Then did R. B. againe & againe discusse these matters, as he had often before, as vvhether the byshopes coulde be saied to preach the vvord of God & minister the sacraments or no. For if that vvere trevve, then also might they call & place ministers: & seing they them selues did minister so great a thing as is the vvorde & the sacraments, they might also minister their help in other things not so great. Therfore to knovve vvhether they preached the vvord of God, he searched & foūd by the scriptures vvhat it is to preach the vvord: namely to do the Lordes message . . . in teaching the people those thinges, vvhereby they might turn them from their euill vvaies & from the vvickednes of their inuentions. Therefore except they haue a due message, they can not preach the vvord off message. For I sēt them not saieth the Lord in that place, nor commaunded them, therefore they bring no profit vnto this people.'[2]

'Therefore though the byshopes teach the people, & geue them lavves, & make manie iniunctions, yea though they be lavves of Christ, yet if they abuse the obedience of the people, to houlde and followve vvith some lavves of Christ their ovvne lavves especiallie, vvhat are they but anti-christes?'[3] . . .

'If then for such doctrine they [the Pharisees] vvere called blind guides and fooles by Christ him selfe, . . . yea & though they sate in Moses seat, that is at first vvere lavvefullie called to teach the people, yet the people vvere charged by Christ toe lett alone such blind guides, & not to be guided by them. Matt 15, 14. hovve much more should we let these blind guides alone, vvhich neuer vvere lavvfully called and also sit in the seat of Antichrist.'[4] . . .

[1] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A verso.
[2] Ibid. Sig. A_3. [3] Ibid. Sig. A_3. [4] Ibid.

In spite of these conclusions on Browne's part, however, his brother (Philip?) applied to Archbishop Grindall for a licence for him, and on June 6, and June 7, 1579, respectively, Robert was granted Dimissory Letters and a Licence to preach, written in Latin, sealed with the Archbishop's seal, and couched in the following terms[1]:—

'Literae dimissoriae concessae
Roberto Browne in artibus
Bacchalaureo &c'

'Willelmus Awbrey et Willelmus Clerk legum doctores officio vicariatus in Spiritualibus generalis et officialitatis principalis Sedis Archiepiscopalis Cantuariensis coniunctim et diuisim legitime fungentes Dilectis[2] Nobis in Christo Roberto Browne in Artibus Bacchalaureo in diocesi Petriburgensi Cantuariensis provinciae oriundo Salutem in domino sempiternam vt a quocumque Episcopo Catholico officij sui executionem obtinenti ad omnes sacros ordines quos nondum es assequutus [assecutus] iuxta morem et ritum ecclesiae Anglicanae in ea parte pie et salubriter editos et ordinatos libere et licite promoveri possis et valeas. Dummodo, etate Moribus et literatura repertus fueris idoneus aliudque Canonicum in ea parte tibi non obsistat impedimentum Super quibus ordinantis[3] Conscientiam oneramus tam Episcopo huiusmodi predictos ordines conferendo quam tibi eosdem recipiendo plenam et liberam tenore praesentium quantum in nobis est et de iure possimus concedimus facultatem[.] In cuius rei testimonium Sigillum quo in similibus vtimur praesentibus Apponi fecimus[.] Datum VI^to^ Die mensis Junij Anno Domini Millesimo quingentesimo Septuagesimo Nono/.'[4]

[1] Text from the copies written in Archbishop Grindall's Register, fol. 176, recto. Letters in italics indicate the extension of abbreviations.

[2] *sic pro* Dilecto. [3] *sic pro* ordinandis.

[4] This may be rendered into English as follows:—

'Letters dimissory granted
to Robert Browne, Bachelor
of Arts, &c.'

'William Awbrey and William Clerk, doctors of law, jointly and separately according to law exercising the office of vicar-general in spiritual affairs and of official principal for the Archiepiscopal See of Canterbury, to our beloved in Christ, Robert Browne, Bachelor of Arts, born in the diocese of Peterborough and province of Canterbury, greeting

'L*icenc*ia predicand*i* conc*essa*
Rob*er*to Browne in artibus
Bacch*alaure*o &c'

'Will*elmus* Awbrey et Will*elmus* Clerk legum doctores officio vicariatus in sp*irit*ualibus gen*er*alis et officialitatis principalis Sedis Archiep*iscop*alis Cantuar*iensis* con*iunc*tim et diuisim l*egi*time fungent*es* Dil*ec*to Nobis in Chr*isto* Roberto Browne in Artibus Bacch*alaure*o Sal*ut*em in aucthore salutis[.] Literar*um* sacrar*um* Sciencia vit*ae* probitas et ali*ae* Dotes prudenci*ae* et virtutis de quibus Nobis Comendaris Merito Nos inducunt vt in com*m*odum eccl*esiae* suscitem*us* hec dona tibi Divinitus Data[.] Ad predicand*um* ig*itur* et exponend*um* verb*um* Dei publice sermone latino vel vulgari Clero et populo in quacu*m*q*ue* Eccl*es*ia per provinci*am* Cantuar*iensem* vbilib*et* constitut*a* modo te laudabil*iter* gesseris l*icenc*iam et facultatem tibi tenore p*raese*ntium Concludim*us* et impertimur ad n*ostr*um b*ene*pl*ac*itum duratur*as*[.] In cuius rei testimoniu*m* Sigillu*m* nostr*um* quo in similibus vtimur p*raese*ntib*us* Apponi fecim*us*[.] Dat*um* Septimo die Mens*is* Junij Anno D*omi*ni mill*es*imo quingent*es*imo Septuagesimo Nono /'[1]

in the Lord everlasting. We grant the means full and free by the tenor of [these] presents, as much as in us is and by law we are able, that by any Catholic Bishop in the execution of his office thou mayst freely and lawfully be advanced to all those sacred orders which thou hast not yet attained, according to the custom and rite of the Anglican Church religiously and beneficially promulgated and ordained in that part, provided that thou shalt have been found of suitable age, character, and learning, and that no other Canonical obstacle in that part hinder thee—concerning which injunctions we burden the conscience, quite as much of the Bishop, who confers these aforesaid orders, as of thee, who receivest the same. In witness of which thing we have caused the seal, which we use in similar circumstances, to be affixed. Dated on the vith day of the month of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand five hundred seventy-nine.'

[1] This may be rendered into English as follows:—

'Licence to preach granted
to Robert Browne, Bachelor
of Arts, &c.'

'William Awbrey and William Clerk, doctors of law, jointly and separately according to law exercising the office of vicar-general in spiritual affairs and of official principal for the Archiepiscopal See of Canterbury, to our beloved in Christ, Robert Browne, Bachelor of Arts, greeting in the author of salvation. Thy knowledge of sacred literature, uprightness of life, and other gifts of prudence and virtue, concerning

Although the Archbishop appears to have been very kindly disposed, Browne, who for the time being seems to have been away from Cambridge, and probably in London, nevertheless says that 'he both refused' 'the bishopes seales'[1] (that is, the licence to preach) 'beffore the officers [? William Awbrey and William Clerk], & being vvritten for him vvuold not paie for them, & also being afterwvard paied for by his brother, he lost one, & burnt an other in the fier, & an other being sent him to Cambridge, he kept it by him, till in his trouble it vvas deliuered to a Iustisse off peace, & so from him, as is supposed, to the bishop off Norwich'.[2]

From Thomas Fuller's account it appears that the call to preach in Cambridge came from 'Bennet-Church'.[3] But though Browne preached there, as he says, 'about halfe a yeare, both by open preaching, & by daiely exhortation in sundrie houses,'[4] 'he did not take charge off them, . . . for that he savve the parishes in such spirituall bondage, that Who soeuer Would take charge off them, must also come into that bondage With them.'[5] Some idea of the preaching that Browne gave the people of Cambridge can easily be obtained from the fact that, among other things, 'he openlie preached against the calling & authorising of preachers by bishops.'[6] No wonder that 'D^r. *Still*, afterwards Master of *Trinity* (out of curiosity, or casually present at his preaching) discovered

which thou art commended to us, justly induce us for the advantage of the Church to stir up these gifts by divine Providence given to thee. Therefore we conclude and bestow upon thee by the tenor of [these] presents the licence and means (to last at our good pleasure) for preaching and expounding the word of God publicly in the Latin or vulgar tongue to the clergy and people in any church throughout the province of Canterbury wherever located, provided thou shalt have commendably behaved thyself. In witness of which thing we have caused our seal, which we use in similar circumstances, to be affixed. Dated on the seventh day of the month of June in the year of our Lord one thousand five hundred seventy-nine.'

[1] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A_3 verso.

[2] Ibid.

[3] The writer knows of no satisfactory evidence that Browne preached in 'Bennet-Church' before this period of his life.

[4] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A_3 verso.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

in him something extraordinary, which he presaged would prove the disturbance of the Church, if not seasonably prevented.'[1] The people, however, seem to have been well pleased with Browne's preaching: 'thei gathered him a stipend, and vvould haue had him take charge,'[2] but 'he refused, and did both send backe the monie thei vvould haue giuen him, and also gaue them vvarning of his departure'.[3] Still 'he continued preaching a vvhile'.[4]

Apparently early in January, 1579/80, 'he fell soare sicke: and in his sicknes vvhile he ceased his labour, he vvas forbidden to preach bie a letter shevved him from the counsell.'[5] This must have occurred about the end of January[6], and Browne says the 'bishops [i. e. presumably the Archbishop's] officer, named Bancraft, did read the letter before him'.[7] This was evidently no other than Richard Bancroft, who on August 9, 1584, was appointed chaplain of Archbishop Whitgift[8], and later became the great opponent of Brownists and Barrowists, as well as of Thomas Cartwright and his sympathizers, and who was probably on that account made Bishop of London, and finally Archbishop of Canterbury. Thus began Bancroft's acquaintance with Robert Browne, and we can hardly imagine that either found the other an attractive personality. However this may be, after giving expression to some rather haughty words[9], Browne promised

[1] Thomas Fuller's 'Church-History of Britain', 1655, p. 166.

[2] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A_4 recto.

[3] Ibid. [4] Ibid. [5] Ibid.

[6] In Archbishop Grindall's Register (fol. 191, recto) is a letter from the Privy Council dated 'London the xvijth of Ianuarye 1579', requesting him not to allow in his diocese any longer such ministers as are 'termed reading and ministring mynysters. and some Preachers and no Sacramente Ministers', &c.

In compliance with this request Grindall issued a general order on 'this xviijth of Ianuary 1579', to send to him the names of 'obstinate and intractable' ministers, as required by 'her *Maiestes* moast honorable pryvye Counsayle', &c. (fol. 191, recto and verso).

[7] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A_4 recto.

[8] See vol. vi. of Charters, &c. (No. 52) in Lambeth Palace Library. The appointment is in Latin.

[9] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A_4 recto.

not to preach longer in Cambridge, and so it appears Bancroft departed.

After Browne had recovered from his illness, evidently in the spring of 1580, and while he was deliberating 'Vvhat he might do for the name & kingdom of God',[1] 'he remembred some in Norfolke [probably meaning at Bury St. Edmunds,[2] which he later visited], Vvhome he harde saie vvere verie forvvard . . . & thought it his duetie to take his voiage to them.'[3] But before he left Cambridge an acquaintance, Robert[4] Harrison, returned thither with the thought 'to haue entred the ministerie',[5] and conferred with Browne concerning the matter, but 'ether chaũging his mind, or disappointed of his purpose, returned to Norvvich',[6] where he held the position of 'Maister in the Hospitall'.[7] This must have taken place in the spring of 1580, and 'a short time after'[8] Browne himself came to Norwich, apparently by previous arrangement with Harrison, and boarded in his house. On the way to Norwich Browne may have visited Bury St. Edmunds.

At this period Norwich had among its population very many Dutch people, who had come over to England for purposes of trade, and it is natural to believe that among them were at least some of Anabaptist tendencies. Whether Browne at this time came to know many of these Dutch immigrants, it is difficult with certainty to say; but it seems extremely

[1] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A_4 recto.

[2] Of course Bury St. Edmunds is strictly speaking not in Norfolk.

[3] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A_4 recto.

[4] As 'A Trve and Short Declaration' always speaks of Harrison as *Robert* Harrison, it appears that Professor Edward Arber and the British Museum catalogue are wrong in calling him *Richard* Harrison.

[5] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A_4 verso.

[6] Ibid.

[7] The Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., in his admirable little volume just published, entitled 'Baptist and Congregational Pioneers', says (p. 33) that this was the 'Old Man's Hospital'.

[8] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. A_4 verso. In the light of present evidence it is apparent that Browne did not visit Holland at this time. His projects had not yet advanced so far.

likely that he at least conferred with some of them.[1] To be sure it has been said that Browne never speaks of the Dutch in Norwich[2], and the writer has noticed that he refers to the Anabaptists only once in all his writings[3]; but in that instance he also has nothing to say against them, a remarkable fact considering the horror with which Englishmen usually at that time regarded them. May we then not justly infer, that while Browne may never have had any sympathy with their views on baptism, he may nevertheless, and especially later in Holland, have found kind men among them, and therefore never felt that he could help to injure them, while his own countrymen were doing all they could to crush him?

It would seem that Browne may now at Norwich have begun teaching again in order to support himself, though he does not mention the fact. However this be, in a letter to Archbishop Grindall 'from the Lords of the Counsaile', dated 'the viij of Iune 1580', complaint is made that 'a greate parte of the Corruption in religion growne throughout the Realme proceadeth of lewde Scholemasters that teache and instructe Children aswell publickly and pryvatly in mennes howses infecting eche'; that all such Schoolmasters should be examined as to their religion; 'And yf any shalbe founde corrupt and vnworthy,' that they 'be Displaced and proceaded withall

[1] Dr. W. T. Bensly, Registrar and Secretary of the Bishop of Norwich, writes that 'in vol. ii., p. 1188, of the "Norfolk Tour", printed in 1829 by John Stacy of Norwich, there is a footnote that Robert Browne preached in the East End or Choir (called the Dutch Church) of St. Andrew's Hall, formerly the Church of the Blackfriars at Norwich'. This may be true, but it needs confirmation. The present writer now feels obliged to conclude that at least before the summer of 1581, and probably even later, the *prevailing* influence in shaping Robert Browne's religious views was the Presbyterianism of Cartwright and others, not Anabaptism; but the latter may nevertheless have had some share later in determining his modes of thought.

[2] The name 'Tatsel' in 'A Trve and Short Declaration' is the only one mentioned in that work which may possibly be of foreign extraction.

[3] In '*A Treatise vpon the* 23. *of Mat*-|thewe', . . . (Sig. H_3 recto), where he says: 'yet againe for this matter they bring in Caluin against vs, and accuse vs for Anabaptistes and Donatistes.' . . .

as other recusant*es* and fytt and sound persons placed in their roomes'. It will be observed that this great desire for uniformity did not proceed immediately from the Archbishop and Bishops but from the Privy Council, of which Burghley himself was a member! In this light Burghley may have been both a persecutor and a defender of Robert Browne.

At any rate Browne steadily advanced in his religious opinions, and not long after his arrival in Norwich, he appears to have come to the conclusion that there could be for him no middle way of reformation such as even the Puritan ministers, Mr. Greenham, Mr. 'Robardes', Mr. More, Mr. Deering, and others were content to enjoy, and that these men could not and would not join in his plan as Harrison evidently had wished. In fact Harrison apparently was at first not averse to partial conformity. Browne and Harrison now seem on many occasions to have talked over the various problems concerning the church, and among them, as to what profit was to be gained from the ordinary preachers of the Church of England, and as to whether faith could be 'wrought' by such preachers.

'Then thei both tould hovv faieth Vvas first Vvrough[t] & bred in the. But herein thei agreed not, because R. H. said that faith might be bred & first vvrought in some, onelie bie reading the scriptures: and R. B. saied, no. For though it might be nourished and increased bie such reading, yet the first Vvorcking thereof, is by hearing the vvord preached: as Paul saith, Rom. 10. 14. hovve shall Vve beleue on him on [*sic*] Vvhom VVe haue not hard, & hovve shall VVe heare Vvithout a preacher. And least reading should be taken for preaching, it is said, hovve shall thei preach except thei be sent. So also least hearing the Vvord, should be taken for hearing it read, Paul saith aftervvard, that faith cometh by hearing & hearing by the vvord of God: meaning by the Word of God the Vvorde off message in his mouth vvhome God sendeth. So then faith is not Vvrought by reading, nether bie preachers, nor bie preaching: but by the preaching of those vvhich are sent bie the Lord, if his grace in our harts do vvorck therevvithall for else all preaching & our hearing also is fruictles.'[1]. . .

[1] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. B, recto and verso.

Thus Browne won Harrison over to his various new opinions, and to this view of how faith was 'wrought' Browne stood fast even throughout the later controversy with Barrowe and Greenwood, and probably to the end of his life. Many of his other ideas, especially those which were somewhat uncharitable, changed with time, and in this respect the father of Congregationalism much resembles John Smyth, the Se-Baptist, and in a certain sense the father of the modern Baptists.

If indeed Browne had now begun to teach again, he certainly busied himself chiefly in gathering together a 'companie' of people and in expounding to them his views on religion. In this work he must have had considerable success, and possibly in order to increase his company he made missionary tours into the neighbouring country. Among other things he told his hearers, '& also set dovvne in Vvriting,'[1] 'that vve are to forsake & denie all vngodlines and vvicked fellovveship, and to refuse all vngodlie communion vvith Vvicked persons. For this is it that is most & first of all needfull: because God vvill receaue none to communion & couenant Vvith him, Vvhich as yet are at one vvith the Vvicked, or do openlie them selues transgresse his commaundementes.'[1]

'Behould their vvorthie building [i.e. of the popish kind of parishes]: it is made of stravves, the beames be stubble, & the vvalls be hai & vvithered grasse: nai rather those their vile & popish decrees & traditions, are the synevves, & veins of that monster Antichrist: their conclusions & lavves made in popish conuocations likevvise their yearli iniunctiõs made to persecute the forvvardest, be the bloud & marrovv or rather the strength and poinson [?] of that monster. Their stinted service is a popish beadrovv [beadroll] full of vaine repeticions as if seauen paternosters did please the Lord better then syx: & as if the chattering of a pie or a parate vvere much more the better, because it is much more thẽ enough. Their tossing to & fro of psalmes & sentẽses is like tenisse plaie vvhereto God is called a Iudg vvho can do best & be most gallant in his vvorshipp: as bie organs, solfaing, pricksong chaũting, bussing &

[1] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. B_3 verso, and Sig. B_4 recto.

mumling verie roundlie, on diuers handes. Thus thei haue a shevve of religion, but in deed thei turne it to gaming, & plaie mockholidaie vvith the vvorship of God. For the minister & people are bridled like horses & euerie thing appointed vnto them like puppies: as to heare, read, ansvuere, knele, sitt, stand, beginn, breake of, & that by number, measure, & course, & onelie after the order of antichrist. Their vvhole seruice is broken, disordered, patched, taken out of the masse book, & a dum & idle ministerie manteined therebie yea a vaine vvorsh[i]p vvithout knovvelege and feeling.

'And vvhat difference is there betvvene praiing on beades, & the mumbling vp of so manye Lordes praiers, so manie bablinges bie the priest, & so manie ansvueres by the clark & people? For no part of the seruice must be left out by the bishops iniunctions.'[1]

This last, it must be admitted, is an exceedingly harsh and spicy passage. If Browne preached regularly in this style, we hardly wonder that the authorities felt it necessary somewhat to temper his spirit, however truly he spoke. The 'companie', however, seem to have been especially pleased with the separatist ideas and 'mauie [i.e. manie] did agree thereto;'[2] but then 'triall by pursuites, losses, & imprisonment cāe, & further increased'[2], and 'some Fell awaie'.[2] In order apparently to overcome such weaknesses, the 'companie' was now more strictly organized by the use of a covenant. This probably occurred early in the spring of 1581. It may be that even Browne himself on account of persecution found it advisable to leave Norwich for a time, and this may account for his journeying about and disturbing the whole diocese of the Bishop of Norwich. At any rate he evidently now carried out the plan he had in mind, just before Harrison came back to Cambridge, of going into 'Norfolke'. It is probable that he visited various places, as well as Bury St. Edmunds, where he made so considerable stir among the people, that he was apprehended not long before April 19, 1581, and Dr. 'Freke', Bishop of Norwich, writing to Lord Burghley on that date,

[1] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. B_8 verso.
[2] Ibid. Sig. C_2 recto.

felt called upon to give the following lively description of him[1]:—

'And herwith I do send vnto *your Lordship* other articles ministred against one Robert Browne a miniester. & his personall answers thervnto, the said party being lately apprehended in this country vpon Complante made by many godly preachers [probably Puritans[2]] for delyvering vnto ye people corrupt & contentious doctryne, conceaved & sett downe more at large in ye same articles. his arrogant spirite of reproving being such as is to be merveled at the man being also to be feared least if he were at libertie he would seduce ye vulgar sort of the people who greatly depend of him [*sic*] assembling them selues together to the number of an hundred at a tyme in privat howses & conventicles to heare him, not without danger of some yll event' . . .

In reply to this communication the Lord Treasurer two days later (April 21) wrote a letter[3], a part of which reads as follows:—

'Forasmuch, as he [Browne] is my kinsman; if he be son to him whom I take him to be, and that his errour seemeth to proceed of zeal rather then of malice, I do therefore wish he were charitably conferred with and reformed, which course I pray your Lordship may be taken with him, either by your Lordship or such as your Lordship shall assigne for that purpose. And in case there shall not follow thereof such success, as may be to your liking, that then you would be content to permit him to repair hither to *London*, to be further dealt with as I shall take order for upon his coming, for which purpose I have written a letter to the Sheriff [of Norfolk, in whose charge Browne then was], if your Lordship shall like thereof.' . . .

The writing of this letter evidently resulted in Browne's visiting London, where he was for some time imprisoned, and

[1] Lansdowne MS. 33 (No. 13), in the British Museum.

[2] See 'A New Years Guift', where Browne says, p. 27, 'for once imprisonment by the byshops, I haue bene more then thrise imprisoned by the preachers or their procuringe/,' and p. 26, 'I haue found much more wronge done me by the preachers of discipline, then by anie the Byshops/.' . . .

[3] T. Fuller's 'Church-History', London, 1655, Book IX, p. 166.

where also he must have received some good advice from his noble kinsman. This imprisonment seems to have suggested to his followers that they ought to flee into Scotland, and some of them in Browne's absence sought to execute their desire. Hearing of this, Browne tried to dissuade them by writing from his prison to the contrary—showing that the company had not yet decided whether they should leave England at all; that they still had work to do in their own country; that they should at any rate not flee like cowards, but rather as delivered 'by the Lord'; and finally, that Scotland was no suitable place of refuge, seeing it was too conformable to England. On this advice the church decided not to remove into Scotland, but nevertheless some suggested that they might profitably go to 'Gersey or Garnsey', i. e. Jersey or Guernsey.[1] To this project Browne replied that he had no objection, except that 'there vvas no such hast to be gone out of England'[2], and that they might well deliberate a little longer over the matter.

After Browne had been freed from his imprisonment, and possibly while on his way back to Norwich, he passed through Bury St. Edmunds a second time, and was again apprehended. From a letter[3] of Bishop 'Freke' to Lord Burghley, dated August 2, 1581, we learn that this second imprisonment began about that date. Dr. 'Freke' now piteously complains,

'that thoughe Mr Brownes late Comminge into my dioces, and teachinge straunge and daungerous doctrine, in all disordered manner, hadde greatlie troubled the whole Cuntrie, and broughte manie to greate disobedience of all lawe and magistrates: yett by the good ayde and helpe of my Lorde Cheife Iustice, and M^r^

[1] That Browne's 'companie' were still very strongly inclined towards Presbyterianism, is clearly indicated by the fact that they first thought of going to Scotland; then to Jersey or Guernsey, where Heylyn ('HISTORY | OF THE | Presbyterians. | ' . . . , Oxford, 1670, p. 290) says Cartwright had not long before 'settled the Presbytery'; and finally they actually went to Middelburg, where Cartwright himself was. These facts make it all the more probable that they at first joined Cartwright's congregation in Middelburg.

[2] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. C_3 recto.

[3] Lansdowne MS. 33 (No. 20), in the British Museum.

Iustes Anderson his associate, the Chefest of suchē factions were so bridled, and the rest of their followers so greatlie dismaied, as I verilie hoaped of muche good, and quietnes [?] to haue thereof ensued, hadde not the saied Browne now returned, contrarie to my expectation, and greatlie preiudeced these ther good proceadinges. Who hauinge priuate meetinges in such Close and secrett manner as that I know not possible [*sic*], howe to suppresse the same,..... And therefore the Carefull dewtie I ought to haue to the Cuntrie beinge my Charge, enforseth me to craue most earnestlie *your Lordshi*ps helpe in suppressinge him especiallie, that no farther inconvenience followe by this his returne,' . . .

About the same time[1] Sir Robert Jermyn also wrote Burghley, saying, among other things, according to Strype's abstract, 'That Mr. Browne came by chance to Bury' this second time; and, in closing, that he would move the said 'lord treasurer to advise Browne to a more careful regard of himself in so deep and dangerous a matter; the man being young both in years and experience; and to threaten him, that he should be very sharply censured to the example of others'.

Apparently within a few days after these letters were written, Browne found himself once more in a London prison, this time for a considerable period. Others also of his little company, probably some of the leading spirits, were hunted out and imprisoned, while the rest were 'in great trouble & bondage out of prison'. Very likely it was late in the autumn of 1581 before they were all free again, and then 'thei all agreed, & vvere fullie persvvaded that the Lord did call thē out of England'.[2]

II. The Separatist Experiment in Holland (Jan. 1581/2?—Autumn, 1583).

It must have been not far from the beginning of the year 1581/2 when Browne's little company, probably by the help

[1] John Strype, in his 'Annals of the Reformation', Oxford, 1824, vol. iii, part I, pp. 30-1, gives a portion of this letter but not its exact date. Where the original is the writer does not know, nor where Dr. Dexter obtained the date he gives to this letter.

[2] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. C_3.

of good-hearted Dutch merchants in Norwich, arrived at Middelburg, Zealand. Browne and a few of the leading men in the church may possibly have gone over before the majority to 'spy out the land', so to speak, and may even have returned in order to give their impressions in person to the company. However this be, Browne's party undoubtedly chose Middelburg as a place of refuge above all others, because of Cartwright's presence there; and knowing how nearly his church must have fulfilled the ideal at least of Harrison, and remembering Cartwright's affirmation in his letter to Harrison [1], the writer would by no means be surprised to learn definitely that Browne's company at first joined Cartwright's congregation. Such a union, however, cannot have lasted long. Very soon at least Browne must have begun to hold his church meetings in his 'chamber', and there generally they were thereafter held. But dissension and envy soon made his life miserable; and adding to this the fact that he was ill part of the time, he must after a while have come to feel that he was faring in his own church in Holland almost as poorly as he had previously fared at the hands of the Bishops. It is certainly a wonder that amid all his trouble he had the courage to defend his position to the world in his well-known volume, entitled, 'A Booke | *WHICH SHEWETH*' [2] . . . Middelbvrgh, 1582, which

[1] 'your first page had raysed me vnto some hope for the reuniting of your selfe, with the rest of your company vnto vs, from whome you haue thought good to sunder your selues.' See Rob. Browne's book, 'An ansvvere' . . . , p. 86. But this passage more probably means that Harrison and his company after Browne's departure for Scotland joined Cartwright's congregation, and then, possibly on Browne's later return to Holland, decided to withdraw from it. This whole matter is perplexing.

[2] The full title reads as follows:—

'A Booke | *WHICH SHEWETH THE* | *life and manners of all true Christians*, | and howe vnlike they are vnto Turkes and Papistes | and Heathen folke. | Also the pointes and partes of all diui=|nitie that is of the reuealed will and worde of God are | declared by their seuerall Definitions | *and Diuisions in order as fol*-| loweth. | ¶ Also there goeth a Treatise before of | Reformation without tarying for anie, and of the wicked=| nesse of those Preachers, which will not reforme them | selues and their charge, because

at first was composed of *two*, and *finally* of *three, separate treatises*, the whole, however, forming one book, not *three* that

> they will | tarie till the Magistrate commaunde | and compell them. | By me, ROBERT BROVVNE. | MIDDELBVRGH, | ¶ *Imprinted by Richarde Painter* [i. e. Schilders]. | 1582.' [4°.]

This book as it first appeared, composed only of two treatises, cannot be said to be exceptionally scarce. As it appeared in its final form with the three treatises, it is very rare; but the idea, which has hitherto prevailed, that only three copies of 'A Treatise of reformation' . . . are in existence, is quite incorrect. Probably at least six or eight copies of that work are to be found in London, Oxford, and Cambridge alone. It is '*A Treatise vpon the* 23. *of Mat*-|thewe,' . . . that is scarce. The pages of the book are not numbered, but as first issued it consisted of Sigs. A_4, B_4, C_2, D_2, A_4–O_4. It is certainly a mistake of Dr. Dexter's to hold that the various parts of the book were published separately, but were also bound up together. The very *structure* of the book on careful examination will show that the three treatises were not intended to be issued separately. In reality, as first published, the book consisted of the two treatises mentioned on the first title-page (which it will be observed is decidedly different from the second title-page, which indeed gives the name 'Robert Browne', but does not have the words 'By Robert Browne', or 'By me, Robert Browne', as would be the case in a genuine title-page), and a *four-page* 'Preface' preceding the second title-page. Later, however, when Browne found that his book was not meeting with the favour in the Church of England for which he had hoped, he wrote another treatise, which he says on the first page of 'A Treatise of reformation' he purposes to write, 'which shall hereafter come foorth.' To this new 'booke' he gave the title '*A Treatise vpon the* 23. *of Mat*-|thewe,' . . ., which in reality is a further development of ideas expressed in the last eight paragraphs of the four-page 'Preface', and takes their place in the complete volume. '*A Treatise vpon the* 23. *of Mat*-|thewe,' . . . consists of the following sections:—'Against the abuse of Tongues in preaching'; 'Against vayne Logicke, being their helpe in the | seconde point'; 'Against their Rhetorike in that point, of doubtfull and | harde wordes'; 'Against their curious Methodes and Diuisions,' . . .; 'Against disordered preachinge at Paules crosse in London,' . . .; and finally '*Against Parishe Preachers and hired Lecturers, and all that Popishe rabble*,' . . . In this issue of the three treatises the old title-page and the rest of the volume, except the four-page 'Preface', were retained. The 'Preface', however, was now cut down to three pages, and five or six new sentences were added in conclusion, stating that Browne already has in mind the writing of still another 'Treatise . . . of the Reuelation of Saint Iohn', 'which we hope shall come foorth,' and that 'The abhomina-

at first were separately circulated, as Dr. Dexter seems to suggest.[1]

Of the completed volume of three works '*A Treatise vpon the* 23. *of Mat*-|thewe,' . . . is decidedly the least known and hence deserves here to be especially noticed. It will, however, also be worth while to give the four following characteristic citations from 'A Treatise of reformation', and to refer the reader for further study to the Rev. T. G. Crippen's excellent reprint of that work.[2] These quotations, it is hoped, will give some idea of Robert Browne's style and views at this period:—

'¶ A Treatise of reformation without tarying for anie, and of the wickednesse of those Preachers which will not reforme till the Magistrate commaunde or compell them.'[3]

'*Therefore woe vnto you ye blinde guides, which cast away all by tarying for the Magistrates. The Lorde will remember this iniquitie, and visite this sinne vpon you. Ye will not haue the kingdome of God, to go forward by his spirit, but by an armie & strength forsooth: ye will not haue it as Leauen hidde in three peckes of meale, till it leauen all, but at once ye will haue all aloft, by ciuill power and authoritie: you are offended at the basenesse and small beginnings, and because of the troubles in beginning reformation, you will doe nothing. Therefore*

tions of Antichriste we shall brieflie there touche, and some chiefer thinges we shall handle more largelie'. However, '*A Treatise vpon the* 23. *of Mat*-|thewe,' . . . was never printed entire, and a contemporary note at the end of the copy in the British Museum says, 'by reason of trouble the print was staid.' Naturally therefore the 'Treatise . . . of the Reuelation of Saint Iohn' never appeared, if indeed it were ever written, but some of the ideas that Browne might have expressed therein are probably to be found in 'A New Years Guift'. 'A Book | *WHICH SHEWETH*' . . . in its final form consisted of Sigs. A_4, B_4, C_2, D_4-H_4, A_4-O_4. One beautiful copy of this last issue, that the writer has seen, by mistake of the binder contains both Prefaces, and thus makes the structure of the book perfectly plain.

[1] 'The Congregationalism of the last three hundred years, as seen in its Literature,' . . ., note 67 on p. 74, where he says the treatises were 'issued separately as fast as printed, but rather with the intention of making one book of the three'.

[2] London, Memorial Hall, 1903.

[3] Sig. A_2 recto.

shall Christ be that rocke of offence vnto you, and ye shall stumble and fall, and shall be broken, and shall be snared, and shal be taken. You will be deliuered from the yoke of Antichrist, to the which you doo willinglie giue your neckes, by bowe, and by sworde, and by battell, by horses and by horssemen [sic], *that is, by ciuill power and pompe of Magistrates: by their Proclamations and Parliamentes: and the kingdome of God must come with obseruation, that men may say, Loe the Parliament, or loe the Bishoppes decrees: but the kingdome of God shoulde be within you.'* [1] . . .

'The Lorde shall therefore iudge these men, and cut them of both heade & tayle, braunch and rushe in one day. The auncient and the honourable men, which take on them to put downe the Lordes authoritie, and to stoppe the mouthes of his messengers, they be the heade, and the wicked teachers which exalte men aboue God, they are the tayle. They are afrayde of the face of the Magistrate, & do flatter and currie fauour with them, and they would haue vs also to doo the like.' [2] . . .

'Nowe therefore let the wise vnderstande these things, and the Lorde be mercifull, and deliuer vs from these vnreasonable and euill men. For there is no ende of their pride and crueltie which ascende vp and sit in the Magistrates chaire and smite the people with a continuall plague, and such of them as haue not yet gotten the roume, do crie for Discipline, Discipline, that is for a ciuill forcing, to imprison the people, or otherwise by violence to handle and beate them, if they will not obeye them. But the Lorde shall bringe them downe to the dust, and to the pitt, as abhominable carkasses, which would be aboue the cloudes, yea which dare presume into the throne of Christe Iesus, and vsurpe that authoritie and calling in his Church, which is opposed and contrarie to his kingdome and gouernement.' [3] . . .

'Beholde, the Lorde hath caste dunge on their faces, euen the dunge of their solemne feastes, as of their Christmasse, and Easter, and Whitsuntide, and of all their traditions, receyued from Baal. For in their solemne meetings, then doeth their iniquitie most woefullie appeare. And they haue saide plainlie (as in the dayes of Malachie) the table of the Lorde is not to be regarded. For though hogges and Dogges come thereto, yet who can redresse it: or why should the Communion be counted polluted vnto vs?' [4] . . .

[1] Sig. A_4 recto.
[2] Sig. B verso.
[3] Sig. B_2 verso.
[4] Sig. C verso.

The following citations are from one of the scarcest and most striking of Browne's printed treatises. There is a wonderfully scathing sarcasm in some of these passages, and the various pictures here depicted are so vividly portrayed that we can almost see them. From what Browne says in these citations we may safely judge that conditions have considerably changed since his day.

'*A Treatise vpon the* 23. *of Mat-*
thewe, both for an order of studying and handling the Scriptures, and also for auoydīng [*sic*] the Popishe disorders, and vngodly cōmunion *of all false christians, especiallie* [sic] *of wicked Preachers and hirelings.*'

'But somewhat it is meete to shewe the disorders of some in that firste point for knowledge in the Tongues. For their hoctpotch [*sic*] at Paules crosse, or at Saint Maries in Cambridge, must needes be fancied by vaunt of the tongues. Paule doeth wishe, *That they all could speake languages*, therefore these will speake Latin, when no man doeth neede it. *They spake the languages* (saieth the scripture) *as the spirite gaue them vtteraunce.* And you may smell out their spirites by the sent of their Greeke or Ebrewe sentences. They cast them foorth, as he that giueth flowers to feed the hungrie, or would make a feaste with the smell of a posie. They spake the languages, in the 19. of the Actes, and also prophesied: and so these speake Greeke and Latin, and I warraunt you, doo edifie withall. They gather such stuffe from Ambrose or Chrysostome, or from some common place booke of Doctorlie sentences.

'These Maidens of the Bishoppes, are called to the Pulpit, and there euerie Maiden must hurle to them her dressing out of a hoode. If John London do not sauce it with a Methode of preachinge, if they haue not his Rhetoricke to make the hearers heedfull, welwillers, and teacheable, (o pure diuinitie), or if their cookerie be not welcomed with the Beadle & the typstaffe, to bring it to the pulpit, then may it go for no seruis. Their Latin is phisik to make hole the sicke, and their greeke and hebrewe wiil [*sic*] blesse you frō euill spirits. By these and by their booke of the order of preaching, they may stand before the Queene, as did Daniel before the king. For so soone as they haue stood vp in famouse places, & shewed

their vniuersitie degrees, and how wel they become their hoodes, or their skarlett gownes, and of what standing in Cambridg, and reading they are of in the tongues and Doctors: There may then be none like them: then must you needes call thē Rabbie, Master Doctor, My Lords Chaplen, Maister Preacher, and our Diuinitie lecturer. This Phisicke will heale all at Paules Crosse in one day. For so soone as they haue shewed it and receyued a Dinner, and their honour and the hope of some preferrement, all is made whole, and they goe away as if no bodie were sicke. There be some also which count it a fault in Pulpites, to recite Doctors sentences, or to speake straunge language, and yet will descant vpon the translation, and shewe what varietie there is, least their learning should be hidd. So because they will seeme to fetche nothing from the Doctours or other authours, they will picke out some matter from their owne fingers endes.'[1]

'Is Paules Crosse Ierusalem, or is the Lordes name there? Is not your [the prelates'] name sounded there, as by the blast of a Trumpet? My Lord Bishoppe there controlleth, in his name the Preacher standeth vp, as the Wolfe doeth in a visarde, he hath the Bishoppes name in parchement, for that is his licence, it is a Theeues quittance though he came in by the windowe, it is the Scourecoastes Passeporte, though he roaue out for his praye. My Lordes face is in the waxe, a print and marke of holines. who can preache without it? It is the seale of ghostlie message. Three such seales, haue threefolde grace, but the money which buyeth them, hath that grace seuenhundreth foulde. Is this nowe the Lordes name, when his Ghospell must hange on parchment, or on the name and markes of those Romishe beastes? Is this his name, when his glad tydinges ceasse, except the parchement holde, and his message misseth except a waxe marke giueth it?'[2]...

'This is now the Throne of the Bishoppes, which in their Dioces, Parishes, and Cathedrall Churches is lift vp against Christ. From it doeth come foorth their lawes and Iniunctions, by which all menne euen small and great, riche and poore, free and bounde, are made to receyue a marke in their hande or in their forehead. For all are made thraules and slaues to their policie, to builde the church, and to worshippe God after their deuisinges They are all

[1] Sig. D_3 recto and verso.

[2] Sig. G_2 verso.

turned backe after bablinge Prayers and toying worshippe, after priestlie Preachers, blinde Ministers, and Canon offices, after Popishe attire and foolishe disguising, after fastings, tythings, holydayes, and a thousande moe abominations: and their feete doo sticke faste in the myre and dirt of all Poperie, that they can not gett out.'[1] ...

'O Church of price, O the famouse church of Englande. Tell ye the Church, that is, tell ye the Bishoppe of the Dioces. The church can geue him authoritie, to authorise both the church it selfe, and the Ghospell, as if God should intreate such a Prelate to be good vnto him: and as if the church should pul him by the sleaue, that he put not out her eyes. O church without eyes, For thy light is shutt vp at the Bishops Beneplacitū. Art thou the church of Christe, when thy starres be not in his hande, but the fystes of thy Bishoppes doo pull them downe from thee? yet is this church of Englande the pillar and ground of trueth. For the Bishops ouerryde it. They are the trueth and it is the ground. It is the Beast and they are the Ryders. It stoupeth as an Asse for them to get vp. The whippe of their spirituall Courtes, and the Spurres of their lawes, and the Bridle of their power, do make it to carie them.'[2] ...

'They knewe those sheepefoldes before time that the Wolfe ruled in them, and there they saw playnelie the face of Antichrist looking ouer them.

'But nowe they hide the Wolue in the folde, and saye, here is Christe: they put a visarde on his face, and say that Antichriste is gone, he shall deuoure them no more. Thou art deceyued O Englande, thou art gone from one destruction vnto another: Thou hast escaped the snare, but art fallen into the pitte. Woe to thee, for thy fall is great, and who shall rayse thee vp?'[3]

'But thou ['O Englande'] art obstinate, thy necke is an Iron synewe, and thy browe brasse. Behoulde thou seest not because thou wilt not see: a visarde hath deceaued the, and the sheepes clothing hath mocked the: and thou saiest, I will follow my shepherdes which haue put away Antichrist, and yet behoulde such rauening & mischeefe as was neuer the like, and wickednes is gone forth from thy shepherdes into all the land. But let them

[1] Sig. G_3 recto and verso.

[2] Sig. G_3 verso and Sig. G_4 recto.

[3] Sig. G_4 verso.

heare his voice which sheweth them what their church and state is, and what is that reformatiō whereof they boast. *The Scribes & Pharises sit in Moses seat*, saith he.'[1]

'Beholde, is not this to giue vs gall and wormewoode mingled in our drinke? Is it not to set vp a Beetle for our guide, and a stocke to teache vs knowledge? Is it not to call a foole to be our maister, and to welcome a messenger as bringing good tydinges, from the Deuill and Satan? Is it not to take a straunger to feede the flocke, whose teeth are of yron, & his tongue and voyce as the sent of a pitt, which breatheth forth death and dostruction [*sic*]? Is it not to put the sheepes clothing on the rauening Wolfe, and then make sport that the sheepe are beguiled? . . . Have these dumme Dogges or tolerating preachers, my letters and seales? I never gaue them sayeth the Lorde, they are stolen and counterfet. yea they haue the seales and licenses of their wicked Bishoppes, and if they haue my message, why holde they their peace at the wicked Bishoppes discharging, as if they had his message onelie. Be it therefore O ye Prelates, that yee put Moses seate for Moses doctrine, Can you preache the Lordes worde and doctrine, or minister his Sacramentes? To preache some trueth as wicked menne may doo, and to preache the Lords word of message is not all one. For his message can not be without his gouernment, & his gouernment is the Lordship he hath in the cōmunion of his offices. But you haue the Popishe lordeship & cōmunion of his offices. you haue not yet planted my Church sayth the Lord, by gathering it from the wicked and vnworthie,'[2] . . .

'O worthie outwarde calling. Doo not the Bishoppes pray when they make Ministers, and shal we condemne their prayers? For the Foxe is a Father in the Church, when he prayeth for grace[.] Are not our ministers duelie examined? They are Posed by master Examiner. Beware ye Priestes that ye can speake Latin. And in anie case forget not your Catechisme. By these two shall you spitte out your grace vpon others, and men shall feede on your graceles spuinges. Breath vpon them ye Bishoppes, and giue them your gracious spirites, which ye call the holy Ghost. So shall they bee those good spirites, like Frogges which come forth of your mouthes to make battell against vs. Kneele downe ye Preachers, that the Bishoppe may ordayne you sitting in his chayre. His holie handes shall blesse you, They are

[1] Sig. G_4 verso. [2] Sig. H verso and Sig. H_2 recto.

washed from blood as was Pilates, and as the nose of a Wolfe which will rauen no more. Then must you take your Licenses in parchement, and paye well for them. Prepare a Boxe for your waxe, printe your message therein, and keepe touche with the Bishoppe, least he open your Boxe, and your calling flye awaye.

'Beholde, this is their outwarde callinge, and if a man haue this, they are called (they say) and sitte in Moses seate. For may not a reading minister serue for a better, if he be thus called? And may not an Idoll serue well ynough, when God doeth forsake them? Shoulde a blinde guide bee displaced, if he be thus called, for he may become learned. So Satan doth call Theeues to steale, and should they not freelie doo it? For they haue a calling, and by stealing they may learne to become true menne.'[1] . . .

Such were Robert Browne's early views. Let the reader keep them in mind, in order to compare them with his opinions of a later period.

A second title-page precedes the last treatise in this volume. It reads as follows:—

'A Booke | *WHICH SHEWETH THE* | *life and manners of all true Christians,* | and howe vnlike they are vnto Turkes and Papistes, | and Heathen folke. | Also the pointes and partes of all diui=| nitie, that is of the reuealed will and worde of God, are | declared by their seuerall Definitions, | *and Diuisions in order as* | followeth. | ROBERT BROVVNE. | [Device.] | MIDDELBVRGH, | ¶ *Imprinted by Richarde Painter.* | 1582.'

Of the contents of this treatise, which is already so well known and which is in some respects the most important of all Browne's productions, being his Congregational Church Polity, we need not speak here, except to say that it is largely incorporated in Professor Williston Walker's admirable work, 'The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism,' New York, 1893, in which form it may be conveniently consulted.

It is hardly to be wondered at that the appearance of this little volume containing the three treatises raised a storm of opposition in England. A Broadside, entitled 'By the Queene. | *A Proclamation against certaine seditious and*

[1] Sig H_4 verso.

scismatical | Bookes and Libelles, &c.,' was promptly issued in June, 1583, commanding, that the books of Robert Browne and 'Richard' Harrison, who are 'remaining presently in Zealande', as soon as published 'and dispersed in sundry places within this Realme', should be brought and delivered up 'vnto the Ordinarie of the Diocesse, or of the place where they inhabite, to the intent they may bee burned, or vtterly defaced by the sayde Ordinary,' &c.

Browne had apparently never given his followers any hope that they might lawfully return to England and enjoy the comforts of their native land, when they became weary of the 'hardnes' of foreign life. Harrison, however, seems to have taught that doctrine and so was more popular. Nevertheless through the curious irony of history Browne eventually returned to live and die in England, while Harrison died in Holland.

Further, Browne's opposition to various characteristics in the government of the Church of England during 1583 and even later was remarkably strong; but before leaving Holland for Scotland in the late autumn of 1583, he admits that his opponents in the 'companie' 'cõdemned him as though he had some times saied (vvhich he neuer did) that some might be of the outvvard church of God vvhile they resorted to that false vvorship & idol seruice then vsed in England, & ioined vvith others therein, but novve blamed them vvhich held such doctrine'.[1] During the last months of Browne's stay in Middelburg he must have had a very unhappy time, and no wonder he felt that he could not endure all this wrangling and criticism. In fact, in his two short years in Middelburg, he was three times for trivial reasons condemned and forsaken by his followers, who finally, having deprived some of those who were still faithful to him of their rooms, threatened also to put him out of his 'chamber' and sought in many other ways to make his life miserable.[2] Thus circumstances gradually forced Browne to leave Middelburg, but evidently

[1] 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . . , Sig. C_4 verso.
[2] Ibid.

he determined first to defend himself against the calumnies that were certain to be raised against him both in Holland and in England. So he wrote that little pamphlet, which was so wretchedly printed and yet is so full of interesting information, entitled, 'A TRVE and | SHORT DECLARATION, BOTH OF THE | GATHERING AND IOYNING TOGETHER | OF CERTAINE PERSONS: AND ALSO OF | THE LAMENTABLE BREACH AND | DIVISION WHICH FELL | AMONGST THEM.'[1] 4°. No place, author's or printer's name, or date is given. There is also no title-page. From internal evidence, however, this appears to be Robert Browne's spiritual autobiography for perhaps the most important years of his life; and Dr. Dexter in locating a copy of this work did one of his greatest services to history.

Browne seems to have had trouble with Richard Schilders (i. e. Painter), the printer of his first volume, while '*A Treatise vpon the* 23. *of Mat-*|thewe,' . . . was in the press. This trouble evidently prevented that work from ever being finished, and also compelled Browne now to have an inferior workman do the printing. Yet even the 'Declaration' also breaks off abruptly and was apparently never printed entire. It was probably unfinished on account of want of funds. Only one copy of the 'Declaration' seems to have been preserved in England; but one copy is enough to show Browne's true character and to make it worth his while to have written it, even though it clearly manifests the failure of his fondest hopes.

Having thus given to the world the story of his early life, Browne must with some sadness, probably in the late autumn of 1583, have turned his back on the little company which once had meant so much to him, but which he was to call his no more. However, on his arrival in Scotland he seems to have been in good spirits, and as active as ever in advocating his views.

It would appear that Browne was first married some time

[1] The pages are not numbered, but the pamphlet consists of Sigs. A_4-C_4, or twenty-four pages in all. It will be noticed that the writer assigns the printing of this treatise to an earlier date than that assigned by Dr. Dexter.

in 1583, though of this we cannot be absolutely certain. The writer would be inclined to date the wedding some time in the summer of that year. Browne's first wife was Alice Allen, of Yorkshire, but inasmuch as Browne cannot well have been in Yorkshire during 1583, the question at once arises as to where he was married and where he met his wife. This difficulty is easily removed by the view that Alice Allen was one of Browne's own company, even the 'Sister Allens' whom he at one time had unjustly criticized, and whom he mentions once towards the end of 'A Trve and Short Declaration,' . . .

III. The Visit to Scotland and the Return to England, resulting in the Subscription

(? Jan. 1, 1583/4—Oct. 7, 1585).

David Calderwood in 'THE HISTORIE | of the Kirk of Scotland | . . . ', vol. iii, of which the original manuscript is in the British Museum [1], has fortunately preserved for us from a now apparently lost writing the following account of Browne's experiences after his arrival in Scotland:—

'Vpon thursday the 9 of Ianuar [1583/4] an english man called Robert Brown come to [*sic*] Edinburgh out of Flanders. He landed at Dundie, and having gottin support there, he come to Sanct Andrewes where he purchased a letter of commendatioŭn frome Mr Andrew Meluill to Mr Iames Lowsone. There come in companie with him 4, or 5 english men with their wives, and famileis. They held opinioŭn of separatioŭn from all kirks where excommunicatioun wes [*sic*] not rigorouslie vsed against open offenders, not repenting. They would not admitt witnesses in baptisme. And sondrie other opinions they had. This Browne wes their preacher. Vpon tuisday the 14 he made shew after an arrogant maner before the sessioun of the kirk of Edinburgh, that he would mainteane that witnesses at baptisme wes not a thing indifferent, but simplie evill. But he failed in the probatioŭn. He affirmed, as the manuscript bereth [*sic*] that the soules died. He and his companie remained at the heid of the Canno[n]gate.' [2]

[1] Harleian MS. 4736, vol. iii. [2] p. 1305.

'Vpon thursday the 21 Robert Browne the ring leader of the Brownists in conference with some of the presbyterie alledged that the whole discipline of Scotland wes amisse, that he, and his companie wer not subject to it, and therefore he would appeale from the kirk to the Magistrat. It wes thought good that Mr Iames Lowsone, and Mr Iohne Dauidsone sould [*sic*] gather out of his bookes and their practise suche opinions as they suspected, or perceaved them to erre in, and gett them readie against Moonday nixt to pose him and his followers thervpon that therafter the king might be informed.'[1]

'Vpon tuisday the 28 Robert Browne with the rest of his complices wer called before the presbyterie of Edinburgh, and continued till the morne. He acknowledged, and avowed his bookes, and other things writtin be [*sic*] him. Mr Iames Lowsone and Mr Iohne Dauidsone wer appointed to gather the erroneous articles to be presented to the king. But they wer interteaned, and fostered to molest the kirk.'[2]

How long Robert Browne and his company remained in Scotland is not known, but he himself certainly must have been there a good while, probably until some time in the autumn of 1584; for he could hardly 'haue knowne the king in great daunger & feare of his lyfe'[3], or 'haue hard the king by name to be verie spitefully abused by their [the Presbyterian] preachers in pulpitt'[3], before June, 1584,[4] about which time the troubles between the king and the clergy of the Kirk probably began to break out. Browne to be sure seems to have met with almost no success in Scotland, but it must also be admitted that Calderwood gives no evidence that he (Browne) was long imprisoned there. The fact rather seems to be, that the king decided to let him have his freedom in

[1] p. 1305.

[2] pp. 1305–6.

[3] 'A New Years Guift,' p. 26.

[4] See 'The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland Edited and Abridged by David Masson, LL.D., . . . Vol. iii., A. D. 1578–1585 . . . Edinburgh, 1880', Introduction, pp. lxiii–lxvi, &c. In May and August, 1584, special Acts were passed in Scotland for suppressing the Presbyterian Clergy and for putting Bishops in their place, who should be under the authority of the king. The state of things pictured by Browne in 'A New Years Guift' resulted from the passing of these Acts.

order to weaken the power of the Kirk. Browne at any rate had abundant opportunity to visit various cities in Scotland, as 'A New Years Guift' amply testifies. The atmosphere, however, cannot have been very congenial to him and he was doubtless glad when the time came to leave the country. His few faithful followers may now have returned to England, or possibly to Holland, where he may have met them later. However this be, he himself, at least for a time, probably returned to England with his wife.

Hitherto it has been supposed that Browne was in prison in London about July 17, 1584, and that his health had begun to be impaired by the various imprisonments he had undergone. For this view, however, there is absolutely no trustworthy authority.[1] On the contrary he appears to have returned to Stamford[2] in the autumn or early winter of 1584.

[1] Hanbury in the first instance is apparently responsible for this error creeping into Congregational history. Dr. Dexter merely followed Hanbury. Now Hanbury cited a transcript, made by Bishop White Kennett, D.D., of Peterborough, of a letter sent by William Burghley to Archbishop Whitgift, dated July 17, 1584, and hitherto generally supposed to pertain to Robert Browne. Kennett, however, misread 'Browne' for 'Brayne', i. e. Edward Brayne, as Thomas Fuller did in the preparation of his 'Church-History of Britain', . . ., 1655. Fuller has a copy of this letter, Book IX, p. 159, but does not give the date, and on pp. 154–161 gives with this three other letters all pertaining to the same matter. Now John Strype had the originals of these three last-mentioned letters, and gives in his Life of John Whitgift a much better text of them than Fuller, and inserts the name 'Brayne' in place of 'Browne'. In fact Fuller has the name '*Brain*' in the last of this series of four letters. Now these letters all speak of the same person, and if 'Brayne' is the one referred to in three of these letters, he must be also in the letter to which we especially refer. To confirm this view the Rev. T. G. Crippen has called the writer's attention to the fact that the very words which Fuller, Hanbury, and Dr. Dexter apply to Browne, are to be found in Benjamin Brook's 'Lives of the Puritans', 1813, under the heading 'Edward Brayne'. Thus falls one of the supports to Dr. Dexter's theory that in the latter part of his life Browne became somewhat insane, which theory the Rev. F. Ives Cater and the present writer now feel obliged to discard.

[2] In that day Browne could hardly have allowed his wife to return to Stamford alone.

There soon after he evidently left his wife, and for some reason, possibly to escape further imprisonment, made his way once more to the Continent, and very likely to Holland. At any rate he seems to have been somewhere 'beyonde sea' on Feb. 8, 1584/5[1], the date when his first child Jone, or Joan, was baptized.[2] Not long after this incident Browne appears to have returned to Stamford[3] from Holland, possibly bearing with him a manuscript that he had prepared, entitled 'An answere to Mr Cartwrights Letter, for Ioyninge | with the English Churches'.

When he passed through London on his way home, he may have put this treatise in the hands of some of his friends residing there and having opinions kindred to his own, who without his direct knowledge caused it to be printed. As the existence of this manuscript was discovered by the writer only last spring, after its practical loss for over three hundred years; as it differs somewhat in spelling from the few still existing copies of Browne's book printed from it; and especially as it is one of his most characteristic and yet least known writings, it will be well to cite from it several of the more important passages. It will be noticed that in certain points at least Browne even now expresses himself somewhat differently from what we might have expected. These points should be kept in mind in tracing the development of his religious views. Against the 'dumbe ministers' he is, however, as vehement as ever.

'How friendlie Mr Cartwright is to it ['the Church of God'], let vs examine bye this his letter, and by the grace of God, let vs trie out the trueth betwixt him and vs. His letter is in manie mens hands, and was sent abroade vnsealed, and open, as if he cared not who should read it. wherefore I may the more bouldlye answere it, and the rather because the matter thereof is publique and pertaininge to the church of God. It came but lately to my hands, and was written, as they tell me more then fyue or sixe

[1] See Mr. Cater's article, entitled 'Robert Browne's Ancestors and Descendants', p. 155.

[2] S. B.[redwell] 'THE RASING | ' . . . , London, 1588, pp. 140 and 142.

[3] Ibid., p. 135, 'before his subscrip. *Brown* being about *Stamford*.'

5 weekes agoe. wherein, if he and others that prouoke [i. e. appeal to] him, sought not to take vs tardie in the trueth, and to worcke vs trouble, we would the lesse haue regarded his letters: But seinge he will needs make vs enimies to the ordinarie and common good lawes of the Realme, to the Church of God in the realme, & to the peace and welfare of the common welth, let vs shortly gather vp his vntruethes and errors, and hurle them out by manifest and knowne marcks, lest anie man do beleue them as trueth. Mr Cartwright doeth moue the first question thus: that the outward profession made by the lawes of the land, and the assemblies of the Church held accordingly are condemned as vnlawfull. This is the short saieth he of Mr Harrisons longer discourse. If he vse to make such shorts, he is not meet to deale with short or longe. . . . First for the Lawes, he knewe well enough, what lawes we ment, namely certaine popish canon lawes, which though the Magistrates do tolerate for a tyme, yet the common good lawes of the lande are wholly against them. . . . Soe then the lawes are a wall to the Church round about: they stand vp as an armed man, that it may shew it selfe openly without shame or feare. For when they putt downe all outward grosse wickednes, and will not suffer it, they do as it were scatter and driue away darcknes from the church, that men may see it visible and cleare as the sunn.'[1] . . . 'For the common lawes are against the canon lawes in manie hundreth points. One geueth check to the other, as twoe Dames at variance in one house. The canon is as fier in the house to burne it, the common is as water powring downe to quensh it. . . . If there be contrarie lawes, one against an other, as through change of tymes, variance of people, and other necessities it may fall out, yet through fauour and help of good Magistrates, the lawes shall still be with the church and not against it. As for the Magistracie of bishops, there is noe lawe to warrant it, but onely hir Maiesties permission. Likewise for the common forme of seruice and praiers, there is exception by the lawe, and it is set downe allso in the booke of common prayer, that the Praiers may be changed, intermitted and left of by occasions: . . . Further whereas the lawe doeth bynd vs to come to the church, it doth well. For noe man ought to refuse the Church of God. . . . And if they [the Magistrates] see to it, that men shall come to church, they will first see that the Church be better ordered, that men may

[1] Fol. 1 recto.

come with comfort and not with hart burning to their conscience. Also for Discipline in gatheringe the worthie from the vnworthie, the law appointeth it and geueth leaue, to make exception both in publique iudgement and in churches against vnworthie persons.... It were to [*sic*] longe to reherse what libertie the lawes doe yeeld to vs, and what outward profession there is by the Lawes.'[1] ...

'But goe toe: he saieth that christ is the head of those assemblies, & not the dumbe ministers. That Christ is their head or foundacion, he can not proue as was shewed before; wherefore for anie thing he can proue, the dumbe ministers, in the absence of the bishops & their officers, are the cheife and heads ouer them. That they are allwaise cheife we said it not; For when the bishopes, which are greater vsurpers are present, then they are heades, & and [*sic*] both the dumbe ministers, and hireling preachers, may serue well enough to be the taile. For Satan hath alwaies by such, as by the taile of the Dragon, drawen the third part of the starrs of heauen, & cast them to the earth. What shall we vnderstand by heauen, but the shew of the church, as it were set in heauen, & by the starrs, but the children of the church, fallinge to wickednes and losing their light. Such are the people of those assemblies, whom Satan hath cast vpon the earth as starrs without light.... Wherefore I would say, there were holines in the dumb ministerie, if all the dumbe ministers were hanged vp in the churches and publique assemblies, for a warning and terror to the rest, that are redie to enter such a function. Then in deed, they were a holie signe and remembrance of Iudgement agai[nst] such wretches; but other holines haue they none in them. Yet Mr C. dare say that their ministration of the sacraments, & reading of praiers, is holie & sanctified; yea so far sanctified that we may lawfully receaue the sacraments of them, & Ioyne with them in Praiers.'[2]

'Suerly these are trimm distinctions to carie him blindfold, he can not tell whether [*sic*]. For whether will he wander in his vanieties? or how manie deuelish doctrines wyll he heape vp together? First he saieth, they are vnlawfull ministers, & yet ministers of God: then that they are ministers of God, but not lawful ministers of God: thirdly that they haue their callinge & allowance by the church & yet are thurst vpon the church: fourthlye that ether such dumbe ministers, and their ministerie is of God; or if they [?] be of the deuill, yet if the bishop & his

[1] Fol. 1 verso. [2] Fol. 6 recto.

officers doe authorise them, then the Church doeth authorise them, & noe man ought to refuse them: Fiftly that their reading of seruice, is to be hard, as being a good thing from Christ: sixtly that their sacraments are to be receaued as good things from Christ: whereby also it followeth that Christ doeth send such dumbe, or blind reading ministers to take charge of the people: also that for a need, reading ministers may be in the church in stead of preachinge ministers. Further that the byshops may thurst vpon the flocke, what ministers they list, & geue them that authoritie and callinge which God can not geue them: Also that the people shall be counted Gods people & church, though they be vnder the deuills messenger, & subiect to his guidinge. How vngodlie & foolish doctrine is all this?'[1] . . .

'But let vs see, what are those things, of Christ, which he saieth the dumbe ministers can geue vs. Forsooth the sacraments & the reading of common seruice . . . wherefore as we shewed before, both their censings & their offerings, that is their praiers & sacraments are reiected of the Lord as execrable things. . . . For their stinted forme of seruice, deuised by the byshops, & translated from the Massebooke, can neuer be proued to be incense made by fier from the altar of the Lord. But yet Mr C. will iustifie their Sacraments & reading of seruice. Let vs therefore see toe his proofes. . . . noe more ought the people at this day, to partake in the sacraments with such blind ministers. But why doeth not Mr C. perceaue, that his owne proofe is against him selfe. For if the Scribs & Pharises were to be hard because they preached trueth, then are these dumbe ministers not to be hard because they are noe preachers. But this proofe failinge, Mr C. prepareth an other. namelye this. The Scribs & Pharises, were as vnfit & as vnlawfull ministers, as our readinge ministers, and yet might be hard, therefore our reading ministers may be hard. How vnfit ministers ye Pharises were, it is after examined. we saye not but that the dumbe ministers may be hard. For if standing on the gallouse to be executed, they say they would come downe, I knowe we may heare them. But the question is whether we may be vnder their charge & guidinge, & so dailie & vsually heare them, as our spiritual guids, pastors, watchmen for our soules, & ministers in the church . . . yea if he looke well, this proofe serueth against him. For the Disciples of Christ were not to heare the Pharises, as being

[1] Fol. 12 recto.

their disciples and vnder their charge, therefore may not we be vnder the dumbe ministers charge, to heare them as our teachers, and guids in Christ. An other proofe he geueth thus : The Dumbe ministers haue a calling by the church, as the Scribs & Pharises had: therefore we may lawfully heare them & receaue them as ministers. In this proofe we haue these matters to consider whether our dumbe ministers haue as good a callinge as the Scribes & Pharises had. whether the bishops & their officers that call ministers are to be counted the church: whether if the church should appoint & receaue a dumbe minister, he had therebye anie whit more authoritie, or were anie whit the rather to be receaued. It is certaine, that Ezra was a scribe, and a preist also of the sonnes of Aaron, as we may read in the booke of Ezra & Nehemiah. And in other places other scribs also are mencioned, which were both writers & preachers of the Lawe & word of God. And therefore Christ saieth that they sate in Moses seat. That is, as it is in 8 of Ezra, they were chosen being men of vnderstandinge to preach & minister to the people as their office required. yea by the preists & elders & consent of the congregation were they chosen. But dare M^r^ C[.] say that our dumbe ministers are thus chosen and called? or dare he saye, that they sitt in Moses seat? . . . Wherefore let M^r^. C. lay away his fond distinction that they are ministers, though they be vnlawful ministers. For if the reading ministerie be noe office nor callinge appointed by Christ, then is it an office of Antichrist; And why then should he stick soe much on the word minister, if they be antichristian & deuelish ministers?'[1] . . . 'Likewise he saieth of the Preists & of Magistrats that some of the preists were domb doggs, & some false teachers, & some had noe soe lawfull callinge, also that some Magistrats are not lawfull & sufficient Magistrats & yet nether the scribs nor the preists, nor the Magistrats were to be reiected as noe ministers nor Magistrats. What true or false doctrine there is in all this, we will shewe by & bye [*sic*]. but graunt it true which he saieth of the Scribes, Preists, & Magistrates: namely that they were soe euill, as he saieth, or taught such false doctrine, yet he him selfe hath geuen the answere before, to condem him selfe. For he saied that the scribes were not to be hard, but in that they taught trueth : and that our dumbe ministers were to be hard, & receiued but soe

[1] Fol. 12 verso and fol. 13 recto.

farr, as they can geue vs anie thinge that is of Christ. Now it is shewed that a readinge or dumbe ministerie is not of Christ, therefore we are not to receaue or heare such a ministerie.'[1] . . .

When Browne reached Stamford after leaving London on his return from 'beyonde sea', he found that in his absence and contrary to his orders his daughter Joan had been baptized at All Saints. This cannot have pleased him at all. Soon also people began to ply him with annoying questions, for instance, as to whether it was not lawful to attend the services of the Church of England; and having admitted that it was not unlawful, he was requested by '*M. Far.* & *M. Har.* Londoners'—

'that he would by some writing, perswade his followers at *London* thereunto, seeing they did at that time vtterly cõdemne hearing with vs. They obteined his letters, which (as they testify) perswaded indeed to hearing in our assemblies, not as children addressing thẽselues to the sincere milke of the word, to grow therby: nor as mẽ plowing vp the furrowes of their harts, to receiue the seed of the holy word to a perfect rooting in thẽ: but in stead of these, other cõditiõs of their hearing were put down, as trying, looking into, & iudging of the doctrine & behauiour of the preachers, and that so they might come, as by occasion & in the way of protestation for such respects.'[2] . . .

Some time during the period before his submission Browne also seems to have had a conference with *M*[r]. *E.*[dmondes?] *and M*[r]. *F.*[ar.?] concerning similar matters, and to have 'admitted reasoning by Sillogismes in his own order, put downe in writing for the forme of the cõference'.[3] A manuscript report of this discussion appears to have been made by Browne, and to have come into Stephen Bredwell's hands. Of what Browne said in this 'Conference' we know but one sentence, namely: 'There may bee a true church of God without the presbyterie.'[4] His stay at Stamford, however, must

[1] Fol. 13 verso.

[2] S. Bredwell's 'THE RASING | *OF THE FOVNDATIONS* | of Brovvnisme. |' . . . , 1588, p. 135.

[3] Stephen Bredwell's '[THE ?] | *DETECTION OF* | Ed. Glovers hereticall confection, | '. . . London. [1586.] p. 123.

[4] Ibid., p. 124.

have been of short duration. His volume entitled 'An ansvvere to Ma=|STER CARTVVRIGHT HIS | *LETTER FOR IOYNING* | with the English Churches: where-|unto the true copie of his | *sayde letter is an-|nexed.* |' . . . London [no date is given], 4°, pp. iv, 96, was evidently soon printed, and on account of its publication some time before May 16, 1585 (the date of the baptism of his son 'Anthonie'), he appears to have been imprisoned once more [1], and to have remained a prisoner until the date of his subscription, October 7, 1585, six months later.[2] Whether he was all this time imprisoned in London we do not know, but probably this was not the case. From a letter of Burghley to Browne's father, dated 'this eighth of *October* 1585' (i. e. the day after his subscription), we learn that he 'had been sent for up by my Lord Bishop of *Canterbury*, to answer to such matters as he was to be charged withall, conteined in a Book made by him, and published in print (as it was thought) by his means:'[3]...On being questioned by the Archbishop he would 'not deny the making of the Book, yet by no means will [would] he confess to be acquainted with the publishing or printing of it.'[3] . . .

Burghley, who evidently knew in advance about Browne's proposed examination, appears to have requested Whitgift to send Robert to him, as soon as it was over. With this request the Archbishop complied, after having extracted from Burghley's young kinsman a subscription to the following five points, which seem to have been administered in the form of five separate questions, to be answered in the affirmative. Bredwell apparently in some way secured the report of this subscription, and has preserved for us in 'THE RASING | *OF THE*

[1] See Bredwell's 'The Rasing' . . . ., 1588, p. 140, where in the fifth section of Browne's subscription the length of this imprisonment is suggested.

[2] This subscription, Mr. Cater and the writer have both noticed, is entirely different from the agreement made by Browne, when he accepted the mastership at St. Olave's Grammar School somewhat over a year later. Dr. Dexter confused the two, and this fact accounts for what he calls the 'haziness' of this part of Browne's life, as told by him.

[3] Thomas Fuller's 'Church-History of Britain'; . . ., London, 1655, Book ix, p. 167.

FOVNDATIONS | of Brovvnisme. |' . . ., London, 1588, probably the most important clauses, &c., but hardly the complete text subscribed. By here and there inserting a word in brackets, and by eliminating a few words, as necessity demands, the present writer seeks to give uniform expression to the various answers. They thus read as follows:—

[1.] 'I do humbly submit my self to be at my Lord of Cant. commandemēt, whose authority vnder her Ma.[iestie] I wil neuer resist nor depraue, by the grace of God.'[1] . . .
[2. I acknowledge] 'that where the word of God is duly preached, and the sacraments accordingly ministred, there is the Church of God.'[2]
'3. [I] acknowledge the Church of England to be the church of Christ, or the Church of God . . . and . . . promise to cōmunicate with the same in praiers, sacramēts, & hearing of the word . . . and will . . . frequent our Churches according to law.'[3] . . .
[4. I] 'promise also quietly to behaue [my] selfe, and to keepe the peace of this church: and that [I] will not preach nor exercise the ministerie[4], vnlesse [I] be lawfully called thereunto.'[5] . . .
'Fiftly . . . I refuse[6] not to communicate in the Sacraments. For I haue one childe that is alreadie baptiZed, according to the order and lawe, and by this time in mine absence, if God haue giuen my wife a safe deliuerance, and the childe doe liue, I suppose it is also baptiZed in like manner. Further, my seruants being three, doe orderly come to their owne Parish Church, according to the lawe, and communicate also according to the Lawe . . . To all these poyntes that they are true, I do subscribe with mine hand and name, this 7. of October, Anno Dom. 1585.'[7]

At first sight one might think some of these answers to be

[1] 'THE RASING | ' . . ., p. 127.
[2] Ibid., p. 134.
[3] Ibid., p. 134.
[4] The last half of this article would seem to indicate that up to this time Browne had not taken orders.
[5] 'THE RASING | ' . . ., p. 137.
[6] This does not look much as if Browne had previously been excommunicated, except by his own will and choice.
[7] 'THE RASING | ' . . ., p. 140.

rather strange statements for Browne to have made, but in a subsequent writing to and against Bredwell, he says:—

'The bishops ciuill authoritie Browne did acknowledge lawfull in his subscription, and their magistracie to bee obeyed . . . hee doeth by those wordes, neither iustifie those for brethren which doe persecute, nor allow an idle and Lordly ministerie in the Church as a part of the brotherhoode.'[1]

'his childe was baptiZed according to order of lawe, . . . But yet it was done without his consent, and contrary to an order he had taken and appointed: for it was baptised in England he being beyonde sea.'[2]

'[his] seruants comming to Church according to lawe, . . . for that he was not to force his seruants agaynst their conscience and custome, being newly come to him, . . . [that he] neuer came to the same Church with them, the parson beeing a common drunkard, and infamous by sundrie faults.'[3]

'he would come to Church according to order of lawe, . . . for that there was no lawe to force him to take such a parson for his lawfull minister, neither to ioyne with him in the prayers and Sacraments.' . . .[4]

These last citations clearly show what this subscription really meant to Browne. It did not mean much, but it meant something; and at any rate with this subscription the early period of his life ends and a new one begins.

[1] 'THE RASING | ' . . . , p. 141.
[2] Ibid., p. 142, incorrectly printed 102.
[3] Ibid., p. 142, incorrectly printed 102.
[4] Ibid., pp. 142–3, printed 102–43.

CHAPTER II

THE PERIOD OF OUTWARD CONFORMITY (Oct. 7, 1585—Oct. 8, 1633).

I. The Years of Literary Activity and Controversy including the Schoolmastership at St. Olave's Grammar School (Oct. 7, 1585—Sept. 30, 1591).

On October 8, 1585, Browne evidently appeared before Burghley, who probably gave him some friendly advice and inquired what it was his purpose to do. Finding that Browne intended to return to Tolethorpe, Burghley gave him a letter to his father, expressing the hope that Robert would later entirely give up 'some fond opinions of his', which Burghley evidently considered he had already partially renounced, and that he 'be dealt withall in some kinde, and temperate manner'.[1]

Evidently Browne was now put on conforming diet, so to speak, and probably a good deal was expected of him. By such treatment he must have been considerably irritated, and also to some extent must have displeased the family, because he did not go to church as regularly as they had hoped. At any rate just before Feb. 17, 1585/6, Robert's father wrote to Lord Burghley requesting permission to remove Robert 'to *Stamford*, or some other place'; to which in a letter of that date Burghley assented, expressing the hope that there 'he might better be perswaded to conform himself for his own good: and yours, and his friends comfort'.[2] But if Browne

[1] Thomas Fuller's 'Church-History of Britain'; . . ., 1655, Book ix, p. 167.

[2] Ibid.

removed to Stamford, he evidently did not do so early enough to avoid complaint for his previous non-attendance at Church services; for the Rev. F. Ives Cater of Oundle has recently and most fortunately discovered 'an entry in the Peterborough diocesan records', which shows that within two months after Burghley's letter was written Robert Browne was having trouble with the authorities at Little Casterton, 'the parish in which Tolethorpe Hall is situated.' Mr. Cater says: 'The churchwardens of Little Casterton appear to have presented Robert Browne and his wife as recusants to Richard Howland, Bishop of Peterborough, who started a suit against them in his Chancellor's Court. The case was brought before Mr. Richard Fletcher, S.T.P., surrogate of Henry Hickman, vicar-general of the bishop, and was heard "in the Chapel of the Blessed Virgin Mary within the Cathedral Church of Peterborough". There were three hearings, on April 19th, May 5th, and June 25th, 1586, respectively. The charge brought against him was "that he will not come to the Churche", and the same charge was brought against his wife. At the second hearing the case was *in statu quo*. On coming up for the third hearing it was stated that the case had been transferred to the bishop's cognizance, and that a personal interview had taken place. It is doubtful whether a record of this interview remains, nor is it easy to say what was the issue of it. Probably Browne was persuaded again to promise outward conformity. In any case I venture to suggest that this citation, trial, and personal interview are the plain historical events out of which grew the improbable and unauthenticated story of Browne's excommunication.'[1]

With this last suggestion of Mr. Cater's, excellent as it is, it is difficult entirely to agree. So far as the writer can learn, Browne's excommunication was first mentioned in print in '*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ:* or, a Collection

[1] 'New Facts relating to Robert Browne,' in the 'Transactions' of the Congregational Historical Society, for January, 1906, pp 239–40.

of Tracts Relating to the Government and Authority of the Church: . . . '[1], London, 1709.

This work says[2]:—

'*Whilst this Dr.* [Thomas Bayly] *liv'd as Chaplain to Bishop* Lindsell, *at* Peterborough, *one thing happen'd which ought not to be forgotten: I have it from a Grave and Reverend Divine now* [1709] *alive, who had it from his* [Bayly's] *own Mouth. The Story in short is this: The Bishop of* Peterborough *hearing, in his Visitation, that* Brown, *the Ringleader of the* Brownists, *liv'd at* North-Hampton, *a Market Town in his Diocess, cited him to appear before him; but he neglecting, or refusing to appear, the Bishop, upon mature Deliberation, Excommunicated him. This so struck the old Gentleman, that he submitted himself to the Bishop, desir'd to be absolv'd, and being absolv'd accordingly, and re-admitted into the Church, never after left it. And Bishop* [Dr. Henry] Lesley [of 'Down *in* Ireland'] *tells us, . . . (without taking any notice of the Excommunication or Absolution)* "*That* Brown *the Ringleader of the Separation in* England, *from whom they were call'd* Brownists, *did afterwards return, conform himself, and for many Years after enjoy'd a good Benefice.*["]'. . . .

Of course Jeremy Collier[3] borrowed his account of Browne's

[1] A copy may be found in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Press mark Th. 8°. L. 137).

[2] See the preface 'to the Reader', pp. xii–xiii. The editor of 'Bibliotheca' and Jeremy Collier evidently believed these testimonies of Dr. Bayly and Bishop Lesley to refer to the same matter, but a careful examination of this citation is certain to make clear to the reader that what Lesley says refers only to Browne's submission, ordination, and subsequent general conformity, while Dr. Bayly evidently has something quite different and more specific in mind.

[3] See 'AN | Ecclesiastical History | OF | GREAT BRITAIN,'. . ., London, 1714, Vol. II, Part II, Book vii, pp. 581–2. Collier does not mention any date of this excommunication (Benjamin Brook apparently first added that), but with some unnecessary amplification follows 'Bibliotheca', and among other things says the excommunication was pronounced by Lindsell, Bishop of Peterborough, who 'being inform'd that *Brown* liv'd at *Northampton*, and was busie in promoting his Sect, sent him a Citation to come before him; he refus'd to appear: Upon which contemptuous Omission he was excommunicated. *Brown* being deeply affected with the Solemnity of this *Censure*, made his Submission, mov'd to Absolution,

excommunication from what is said in 'Bibliotheca', but added thereto certain details supplied by his imagination, and united into one account with material gleaned elsewhere the utterly distinct testimonies of Dr. Bayly and Bishop Lesley, thereby confusing the whole story of Robert Browne's life. While the writer, therefore, cannot accept Mr. Cater's suggestion as to the source of this excommunication story of 1586, he is able entirely to agree with him in believing that Richard Howland, Bishop of Peterborough, never excommunicated Robert Browne. In fact the Rev. T. G. Crippen apparently is the first ever to have declared in so many words that Howland excommunicated Browne. Dr. Dexter said that Bishop Lindsell excommunicated him about 1586, an evident impossibility; and Mr. Crippen in his account, with excellent intent, substituted 'Howland' for 'Lindsell', thereby removing the obvious anachronism, but unfortunately at the same time only the more obscuring the truth. Dr. Dexter apparently never looked critically into this matter of Browne's excommunication, but without question accepted Benjamin Brook's assertion, with the result that a very considerable error at this point has crept into our understanding of Browne's career.

During the previously mentioned interview with Bishop Howland of Peterborough in 1586 Browne may have relinquished his desire to 'exercise the ministerie', which 'exercise' possibly Howland may have somewhat allowed after the subscription; but of this we cannot at present be sure. We only know that Burghley, writing to Howland

and receiv'd it; and from this Time continued in the Communion of the Church'.

What flimsy history Collier wrote in his account of Browne's life, may to some extent be seen by briefly examining this citation. In the first place Augustine Lindsell was not appointed Bishop of Peterborough until 1633 and he remained in that position about one year (see William Stubbs' 'Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum'. . . Oxford, 1858, p. 175). Now Collier himself says that Browne died in 1630, an error, however, which he borrowed from Fuller. Further, as far as the present writer can judge, Browne never lived at Northampton, nor did he ever 'promote' his sect there.

three years later, on June 20, 1589, expressed the hope that he would 'receaue him [Browne] againe into the Ministerye, and to geue him *your* [his] best meanes and helpe for sum eccl[es]iasticall prefe[r]ment'.[1] This statement certainly looks as if Bishop Howland had allowed Browne at some time before that date at least to preach in his diocese.

After his interview with the Bishop of Peterborough in the summer of 1586, and perhaps at the Bishop's advice, Browne seems to have decided to return to his earlier occupation of teaching. He came up to London, and on November 21 of this same year he became schoolmaster in St. Olave's Grammar School, Southwark, upon agreeing to the following terms, still contained in the Minute Book of that well-known and ancient Institution:—

'Item the xxj^the^ daye of November Anno Do*m*ini / 1586 / was chosen to bee scholemaister Rob[er]te Brownne[2] vpon his good behauiour & obseruinge theise artycles her vnderwritten. / / / / [etc.]

'Fyrste that you shall not entermedle *your* selfe with the minister or mynestrie of this parrishe or disturbe the quiet of the p*ar*isheoner*es* by kepinge any conventycles or conference with any suspected or desordered p*er*sons

'Secondly that yo^u^ shall[3] bringe *your* Children to sermons & lectures in the Churche & theire accompany them for their better gouernment /

'Thirdly yf any errour shalbe found in you & you convincest [*sic*] therof that you shall vpon admonition[4] [?] therof revoke yt & conforme *your* selfe to ye doctryn of the Churche of England

'Fourthely you shall reade in yo*ur* schole no other Cathechisme then is ac[?u]thorysed by publicke authoritie /.

'Fyftly that you shall at Conveniente tymes com*m*vnycat in this p*ar*ishe according to the lawes

[1] Lansdowne MS. 103 (No. 60).

[2] The name in the original minute is interlined.

[3] The word 'not' was written between 'shall' and 'bringe' at first and then was crossed out.

[4] The word 'admonition' is inserted in place of 'dyrection', which has been crossed out.

'Sixtly not beinge contentyd to answere & kepe theise articles not longer to kepe the scholmaistershippe / but to avoyde yt

'Subscribed by me Robert Browne according to my answeres before all the gouernours, & the distinctions & exceptions before them named.

'These governors whose names followeth were present at the chosinge of the sayd Robert Brownne viz Mr Absolon [?]ersonn Thomas Smithe minister Richard Sampsonn Richard Hutton, Rob[er]te Couche Thomas Pinden Richard Denman Richard Pinfold John Byrd Thomas westwray Iohn Selbey Robert Foltham Rychard Atkinsonn & Peter metcalfe [?]'[1]

During the period of his schoolmastership at St. Olave's, Browne can have led no very happy life. Not long after he came to London, Stephen Bredwell's first book appeared, bearing the title[2]:—

'[THE?] | *DETECTION OF* | Ed. Glouers hereticall confection, | lately contriued and proffered to the | *Church of England, vnder the name of* | A present Preseruatiue. | VVherein | With the laying open of his impudent slan-|*der against our whole Ministrie, the Reader* | *shal find a new built nest of old hatcht heresies* | *discouered, (and by the grace of God)* | *ouerthrowne: togither with an ad-|monition to the followers of* | *Glouer and Browne.* | By Steph. Bredwell, Student in | *Phisicke.* | Seene and allowed. | ' . . .

[1586.] London. 8°. pp. xiv, 125, i. 'Printed by Iohn Wolfe.'

The part of this book devoted to Browne is comparatively insignificant; but he nevertheless seems to have felt obliged to defend himself against its insinuations by a writing, which Bredwell[3] later describes as 'a raging Libell . . . *sent abroade, in sundrie written copies*'. None of the manuscript copies of this 'Libell' are known to exist to-day, but it seems to have consisted of one hundred and twenty sections, of

[1] Deciphered and transcribed by the courtesy, and with the help, of Mr. Rushbrooke, Head Master of St. Olave's Grammar School, Tower Bridge, London, S.E.

[2] From the unique copy in the Cambridge University Library (Syn. 8. 58. 10).

[3] In 'THE RASING | ' . . . London, 1588, p. 61.

which Bredwell in 'THE RASING | *OF THE FOVNDATIONS* | of Brovvnisme'. | . . ., London, 1588, has preserved certain citations. From these we may easily obtain an idea of its general tone. Here are several of the most important portions:—

['Numb. 3.'] 'Glouers popery or popish heresies, being long ago by many diuines refuted, needeth not Bredwells childish refutation, whereas the cause wherein Bro. hath stood as yet is refuted by none.'[1]

[This passage plainly shows that Edward Glover was no co-worker of Robert Browne's, as Dr. Dexter seems in his account to suggest.]

['Numb. 20.'] 'Thou hast written it heeretofore, that there is no Aegipt in England, and hast thou now found vs out to be in Aegipt, Doest thou not perceiue, that thou and thy partakers, abusing your knowledge to persecute those which are come out of Aegipt, are worse then Aegipt, yea princes of Sodome, and people of Gomorrha? looke thou to it, that thou remain not in Aegipt. Thou hast confessed that we were once come out of Aegipt, thou canst not say so of thy selfe, if still thou iustifie thy Aegiptian doctrine & pollutiõs, as is to be seen by thy pamphlet'[2] [i. e. '[THE] | DETECTION OF | Ed. Glouers hereticall confection, | ' . . . [1586]].

['Numb. 28.'] 'We haue gained, by fleeing from persecuting wolues, not wealth, nor bellycheere, nor fauour in the world, but losse, imprisonment, all manner [of] euil speaches, and death it selfe.'[3]

[Numb.] '75. If all were such persecuting wretches as Bredwell is, they were not only infidels, denying the fayth, but also woorse than infidels, because they yet suffered the beleeuers to dwell in the same house with them: but Bredwell and his partners would not suffer them to dwell in the same Citie with them, no not in the same Countrey, no not vpon the face of the earth.'

'num. 77. Nay false hypocrite, . . . It is thy maner and thy

[1] p. 134. [2] pp. 132-3.

[3] p. 133. Those who, with Dr. Leonard Bacon, think that 'Robert Browne was not a martyr', and that 'he was not of the stuff that martyrs are made of', do him the highest injustice, as this citation alone amply shows.

partners, to force, to threaten, to make stirrings and hurlie burlies, and to driue man and wife asunder. [Such treatment as this may have been the cause of Browne's later domestic unhappiness.] Thine and their outrage cannot be satisfied with bloud. Thine and their raylings, slaunders and false accusations, haue brought diuerse of vs to death, some by the Gibbet, some by long imprisonment, some by flight and pursuit, some by extreame care, death and sickenesse: some by seas, some by necessitie and want, some by chaunging aire, dwelling and place. The bloud of all these shall bee vpon thine and thy partners heades.'[1]

['Numb. 105.'] 'VVhile they [the ministers of the Church of England] raile & resist the truth . . . we may heare them as enemies, but ioyne with thē as brethren we dare not.'[2]

During this period of Browne's career Bredwell also appears to have had other dealings with him. One of Robert Browne's followers, whose name seems to have had the initials W. F., and who evidently had been urged by Bredwell to come to church, wrote to him asking for a sufficient reason. Bredwell replied, and his answer came into Browne's hands, who responded for W. F. in a writing concerning 'the question of communicating', of which the original is totally lost, and of the contents of which we have but the following three sentences:—

'Thus your writing condemneth you of iniquity, that speake not one word in the pulpit [Bredwell was a medical student, not a clergyman, as Browne, when he wrote this, seems to have supposed], against the restraint by popish discipline, that ye cannot separate. How sore do you labour, and how much do you suffer, that dare not speake a word by name against those officers and courts, neither name nor protest openly against those wicked, against whom you would haue vs protest particularly and by name. . . . But why labour you not also to charge them openly, though it cost you your life and liuing?'[3]

This communication must have been penned either after Bredwell's first book had been written and was in the press,

[1] pp. 114-5. [2] p. 136.

[3] 'THE RASING | '. . ., 1588, p. 132.

or before Browne saw a copy of it, for '[THE?] | DETECTION' . . . plainly states on the title-page that Bredwell is a 'Student in *Phisicke*', and no mention is made in it of this writing of Browne's concerning 'communicating'.

Bredwell published his answers to all these writings of Robert Browne, with an account of Browne's life and literary activity during his schoolmastership in Southwark, in his book which appeared in 1588, when Browne had been about two years in that position, entitled as previously stated, 'THE RASING | *OF THE FOVNDATIONS* | of Brovvnisme. | . . .'; and to-day right glad may we be that this book was written and published, for it is a mine of information.

From this work we learn that up to August 12, 1588, Browne had not communicated in the sacrament at St. Olave's, in fact that before this date, in order to avoid partaking in the Communion, he had moved into another parish; that sometimes he attended the preaching services, but 'as a censor to iudge, not as a brother to learne'; that he had written a treatise of 'v. or vi. sheetes of paper' for one 'seelie woman' in the parish of St. Olave's, and thereby had so confirmed her 'in her sottish separation' that there appeared to be 'vtterly no hope of her recouerie'; that he had sent his writings against Bredwell 'to a hundreth miles distance from *London*'; that 'somewhat later' he had 'disturbed the cōgregatiō at *Dertford*, drawn away some, railed opēly & dispersed writings, as of chalenge against the lecturer', Mr. Edmondes, because he had advised his people of the danger of Brownism; that since Browne's subscription he had preached in private houses, '& namely amongst the rest, one *Lordes day*, & not farre from *Ludgate*: hauing a litle before in the same house earnestly contēded against, in reasoning, & disswaded frō publique hearing'; that on this occasion Browne had also exercised 'the ministerie of preaching', inasmuch as 'he was earnestly requested vnto it by those that were present', this fact in his opinion evidently constituting a 'lawful calling to that ministrie'.

Now while Browne was having discussions with men on the side of the Established Church, he was evidently at the

same time engaged in another controversy with Barrowe and Greenwood, who had carried Cartwright's and Browne's early teaching to extremes, but who would in no wise acknowledge themselves to be indebted to Browne, after his subscription. This controversy with the Brownists [or Barrowists?] in London doubtless began at least not much more than half a year before October 7, 1585, about which time, probably at the request of '*M. Far. & M. Har.* Londoners', he sent letters to 'his followers at *London*', as before mentioned, to persuade them that 'it was not vnlawful to heare the Word' in the churches of the Establishment. Apparently these letters were answered, for Browne in a later writing mentions sending Barrowe and Greenwood 'the platforme'[1], and also a treatise[1] in which the following conclusions concerning the ordinary preachers in the Church of England were expressed, namely, 'their lawfull preaching of the word', 'Secondlie their sending and calling,' 'Thirdlie the blessing liking or allowing of their bringing of the ghospel/.' It is to be regretted that neither of these manuscripts is known to be extant, but fortunately the most important of all this series of Browne's writings was accidentally discovered by the present writer during the past year. This manuscript is in fact the lost key to the true understanding of the latter half of Browne's life. Bredwell referred to this treatise at considerable length in the preface '¶ To the Christian Reader'[2] in 'THE RASING | *OF*

[1] Mentioned in Browne's long-lost MS., entitled, 'A reproofe of certeine schismatical persons & their doctrine | . . .'

[2] [pp. ix.–xi.] The whole section reads:—

'Of mine aduersaries [the Brownists] I rather knowe the nature then the number. Although (as it hath been obserued) sundrie among them, from time to time, haue laboured to be leaders, and so vpon the spurre of emulation haue galloped as hard as they could: yet without all question, there is none among them that can iustly take the garland from *Rob. Browne*. His writings doe foreiudge the cause agaynst all his competitors. And albeit newe maisters are risen among them, that nowe, in a fresh hote moode, condemne his coldnesse and colourable dealing, and that worthily: yet they must, euen *Barow* and *Greenwood*, with the rest, acknowledge him the shop of their store, and the steele of their strength: . . . But some will obiect, that these that I name, agree not among themselues: and therefore cannot be accounted of one

THE FOVNDATIONS | of Brovvnisme. |' . . . , 1588. Apparently this writing of Robert Browne's has been practically lost

familie. . . . *Barow* and *Greenewood* nakedly discouered their profession, and are prisoners. *Browne* cunningly counterfeiteth conformitie, and dissembleth with his owne soule, for libertie. . . . Hence cōmeth that grudge, quarrell and heartburning among them. They expostulate with him as a coward, and one that shrinketh in the wetting. He againe nippeth them for their egernesse, in running before their olde maister, and thereby obscuring his light, as though the truth (forsooth) had first bin reuealed by them. It seemeth, they would not heare a sermon, to gaine their libertie. But it is manifest, that he to redeeme trouble, hath learned to apply himselfe to all times, places, and persons. Nowe in this their iarre, manie strange paradoxes and grosse absurdities haue passed betweene them: arguing both sides to haue trusted in their strength, and therefore to haue beene destitute of the spirit of truth to guide their pennes. *Barow* and *Greenwood* denie [Marginal note. 'As appeareth in a writing that came from Brownes hand of this matter.'], *that our preachers doe preach the woorde, and that they doe, or can beget fayth.* They say, *The wicked haue no woorde of God, no graces of* GOD, *no spirituall or sanctifyed graces, that they doe no good, that they may not teach, testifie, preach or counsaile anie woorde of* GOD, *anie religion or dutie of religion. That they haue no kinde of promise nor blessing: and that there is no Communion to bee had with them in spirituall graces. They denie fayth to come necessarily, by the woorde of* GOD: and say, *It may bee begotten without anie promise of the woorde.* Beeing demaunded, *what faith doeth beleeue*: They aunswere: *God, without anie consideration of his woorde and promise.* Likewise beeing asked, *howe they came by their fayth*, it seemeth they aunswered, *as it pleased God*: namely, *by his spirite:* but not acknowledging the outwarde meanes. Some of them graunt, *our preachers beget fayth or beleefe of the woorde, but not the fayth of Christ.* Hee prooueth it not the fayth of Christ, *because it hath not good woorkes:* Which hee specifieth to be *Idolatrie, Rebellion and Bondage.* They say, *our ministers bring a newe Gospell.* That *the lawe in their mouthes, and the sacrifices or presumptuous ministerie of Korah, Dathan and Abiram are alike.* And they make no better account of *our Parish meetings, than of the meetings at the groaues and hill altars.* O wofull men, and drunken with the wine of their owne headie conceites. Browne againe, for feare all these reproches shoulde light vppon him, because hee commeth into our Churches, ꝛainseth the matter euerie where, with these ill stampt distinctions, *Of the better and woorser sort of our preachers*: (wherein hee leaues his meaning doubtfull still,) and of *ioyning with vs in the common graces, both worldly and spirituall, but not as in one bodie, and couenant of the Church.* O mocker: Let the Lorde iudge thy hypocrisie, for no man can sounde it. Concerning the disputation of both parties in this matter

sight of from Bredwell's time to the day when the writer unexpectedly discovered it; and before this was found, the real extent to which Browne gave up his earlier views was unknown. Mr. Cater has sought to show that Browne's life in reality was a reasonably consistent whole. This manuscript makes it plain that that position is not strictly correct; but it nevertheless shows Browne off to advantage, even while revealing his inconsistency. In fact it is such a production that it makes us glad to examine his new point of view.

This manuscript is undated and anonymous, except for the following endorsement in a well-known contemporary hand, 'Mr Brownes | Booke | Sent [Lent?] | me,' but the handwriting of the document also is unmistakable. The full title of this writing is, 'A reproofe of certeine schismatical persons [i. e. 'Barow and Greenewood'] & their doctrine | Touching the hearing & preaching of the word | of God.' The section in Bredwell seems to indicate that it was written in the latter half of 1587 or in the first half of 1588. Inasmuch as the material in this treatise is fresh, it may be worth while here to devote some space to the treatment of it.[1]

if I bee asked my iudgement, this must I say: Browne hath sufficiently ouerthrowne the manie assertions of his young maisters, as hee calleth them, in prooving *our preachers to haue a calling, because they beget fayth: that they preach the woorde, because they beget fayth:* For examples: *in him and themselues they haue done it, ergo, &c.* And that, *The knowledge of reformation and discouerie of Church corruptions came first to them by their preaching, ergo, &c.* And as they number vp all the euils they can finde in the doctrine and practise of our preachers, to prooue *they can doe no good, nor beget faith*: hee contrariwise by a full floud of *their true doctrine, and good fruits* (whereof he maketh a copious catalogue) woorthily quencheth the furious flame of their slaunderous tongues. Also by the *sitting of the Scribes and Pharisees in Moses chaire, and the commaundement of hearing them,* he verie sufficiently proueth that wicked men may preach Gods worde, and being in such office, charge and calling, ought to be heard. The cauils they make against these things, are such, as shew them wilfully to stoppe their eares, least the sounde of truth shoulde smite their hearts. In these pointes I testifie, that *Browne* hath well confuted their furie. . . .'

[1] The story of the discovery of this manuscript is here omitted, inasmuch as it is hoped that the publication of a complete edition of this writing, with a suitable introduction, may later be possible.

The extended passage from Bredwell settles the identification of the treatise; for while even the italicized expressions are not always what we would call quotations in the strictest sense, and while he sometimes rearranges the expressions he quotes or summarizes to suit his own convenience, yet he has quoted enough, has used a sufficient number of peculiar expressions and words, and summarized with such minuteness, as to leave no shadow of a doubt that he had this manuscript before him. For this minuteness in Bredwell's description we should be profoundly thankful, as without all these particulars we would probably never have known for certain against just what persons Browne was writing, and might possibly be inclined to date the manuscript several years too late. Further this passage adds considerably to the interest of the manuscript itself, since it shows that this work of Browne's was in his own day considered important; and conversely the treatise heightens the interest of the section in Bredwell, as supplying its original source.

We may now pass to a brief description of the appearance of this manuscript written against 'Barow and Greenewood'. It is a document probably of between twenty-five and twenty-eight thousand words, and covers thirty-one closely written folio pages. It is properly divided into two sections, containing answers to two separate writings of Browne's opponents. It is not a beautiful production (as are the manuscripts of 'A New Years Guift' and 'An answere to Mr Cartwrights letter, . . .', which latter is probably the most extended writing in Browne's hand now in existence, and must contain at least thirty thousand words), nor was it apparently intended for the printer. We cannot even be sure that 'A reproofe . . .', as we now have it, contains all that Browne wrote in the first section, which appears in any case to have been left unfinished. Throughout, in fact, this document bears every mark of haste. Many words have been crossed out, and four or five whole paragraphs in different places have been blotted out with a sort of ink-like black paint, as carefully as if done by a censor. Further the whole outer top corner of pages 7 and 8, at the beginning of the second section, has been torn off, and the

paper under the blotted paragraphs is beginning to crack and break off. Nevertheless on the whole, in spite of these defects, which in so extended a writing are after all comparatively insignificant, the manuscript may be said to be in very good condition.

To give a minutely exact and logical description of the contents of this treatise is practically impossible, for evidently it is not a discussion logically developed by Browne himself, but is rather a refutation of the views of his two opponents in the order followed by them. Again, the continuity of the thought is all the more broken by the fact that 'Barow and Greenewood' evidently did not entirely agree with each other on the topics discussed. Hence the present writer has decided to give the following quite general summary of the principal ideas for which Browne here contends, as this method ought to furnish the reader with a really more serviceable introduction to a study of the treatise than a more minute, but necessarily more confused, statement of the various points under discussion:—

I. A short introduction, giving the occasion and purpose of the treatise.

II. Discussion:—

1. (*a*) The preachers of the Church of England, whether good or bad, have the Word of God and preach it truly, because they beget faith.
   (*b*) These preachers are also sent by God, and have a sufficient calling, because they beget faith.
   (*c*) Since they have a sufficient calling, they may be heard.
2. We all owe a debt of gratitude to these preachers of the Church of England, since the knowledge of abuses and the desire for reformation, even in yourselves, came first of all from their preaching.
3. Further, the ordinary preachers in the Church of England are now themselves preaching against

all the principal abuses (Browne enumerates 50) that have been noted; and as these men are occupying positions which you should honour, it is ungrateful of you to carry on any longer a rigidly separatist reformation against them.

III. A brief conclusion.

The writer believes this to be the general line of argument intended to be advanced by Browne in this treatise, but expressed by him in much looser fashion.

As the reader may have surmised, in so extended a writing on such a subject, there are many passages of considerable interest, a few of which only can here be given. Browne begins with the following kindly words:—

'You seeme to seeke quietnes and peace, and to proffer and call for loue in debating theis matters: Then geue forth no cruel verdite against vs, and let ech syde stay all rash iudgment and sentence, tyll the trueth be duely skanned, afterward duelie offered and charitablie vrged, and then let the obstinat be iustly reproued. If you had delt herein according to this and according to our request long ago herein there had bene more peace and loue then in deed we haue found at your hands.'

'I haue not as yet your whole writing, no not one whole sheet thereof though very instantly I haue sought it all: But I know not what loue or good counsel hath kept back, & denied me the sight thereof.

'Well it walcking abroad, now a long tyme as I heare in other mens hands, & gathering strength to it selfe, because it hath no full nor due check, I tooke in hand this present wednesday, in the name & feare of God, If it may be by his grace & fauour, to stop the euill course thereof.

'The Lord set our hartes and penns as sanctified means, & appointed to beleiue & [?] testifie his trueth onelye, Amen.'

These opening lines very well illustrate the general tone of the treatise. Somehow we can hardly imagine Robert Browne at this time writing in so calm a spirit, and especially giving expression to ideas that we have hitherto supposed were only wrung from him by the intensity of his

persecution; but we may perhaps presume that in reality up to this time we have seen little more than one side of his life. Indeed throughout the whole manuscript Browne uses practically no phrases that could be called harsh or resentful, unless they be the following:—

'nether may those receiuers alledge saying, we are turned away from our first teachers & preachers, for they are naught, & what good did we euer take by them / ?' . . .

'Yet you without feare dare vaunt, and mocke them and vs, first in pulling from them their credit, & then bidding them get it againe if they can, also in reprochfull deniing of that faieth & knowledge they haue taught & you learned daring them or facing them to proue it.'

'But rather you yong Maisters, which haue eaten and filled your selues of your ould Maisters labours, do now kick vp your heeles against them, and not onely would put them from their right, saiing that the Ghospel & true faieth did first of all come from you / but also do chalendge them as dastards because you dreame or rather crack a victorie before hand.'

'Theis things I am loth to discourse so largely, but much more vaine philosophie in you then this is, which is not espied, shall hereafter heap vp much more busnies [?] to your answearers [?]; and not onlie astonish them that such as you & so manie of you should be beguiled with them so longe, but also as raging waues dash vpon them, tyll by Gods help, they haue sent them downe to that gulfe beneath, & turned their streame to that hellish lake, whence they shall neuer retourne / .'

Finally, this writing simply abounds in passages in which the thought is strikingly remarkable as coming from Browne. The following examples may be given:—

'How much more blessed are they that preach the whole ghospel & that purelie, I meane truelie, as do soe manie [in the Church of England] at this day.'

'Thirdlie you should learne that The Byshops & Courts, & all higher Magistrats haue authoritie to deale in all spiritual & ecclesiasticall matters, & who so euer doeth cut of them [*sic*] all right to deale in spiritual things, doeth whollie ouerthrow all authoritie / seing there is no duetie, lawe, deed, cause, quæstion, or plea, etc

which ought not to be spiritual, or is not determined by the diuine & spiritual right, law & word of God /.

'Yea and the iniunctions & statutes do permitt & geiue leaue to speak against all abuses in all things, ([*sic*] But with theis exceptions, ([*sic*] that we speak not reprochfully, railingly, willfully & obstinatly, but in humilitie as we ought, & as being vnder correction & iudgment of magistrats if we speake amisse, read the statute & you shall fynd such like words /.' . . .

'Also we doubt not but that a forme of Praier may be præscribed, so that still the libertie of vsing or appliing those praiers bring not a bondage, So that the minister and people do vse them wel as they haue iust & lawfull occasion: And herein the Magistrat must iudge as well as the minister. and if the minister vse his forme of Praier amisse, the Magistrate may call him to accounts & punish him.'

'Yet further we say, that your owne harts do tell you, that you haue no knowledge of anie abuses, against which the preachers haue not, & do not most vsually preach & you learned that knowledg of them. For though some preach some things corruptlie, & the same men do some tymes stand with and against one & the same abuse /. Yet the better sort & greatest number haue left no abuse vntouched, but with much zeale & great patience haue cried out against them in this age & suffered persecution for them in former ages as some by fleing their contrie, some by losing their liuings, place & standings, some by imprisonment, arraignment & burning at the stake /.' . . .

'Also you make difference of Scribs & Pharises, and of Parson, vicare, Curate /. But what so euer title the world geueth anie preacher or minister, if he do his duetie we must honour him, and not dispitefully call him, as you do, the excrement of Antichrist /.

'And if he do not his duetie, but be a vile person, by offending vpon ignorance in waightie matters in knowledg, zeale, good conscience against some or manie synns / and in guifts of vtterance & preaching, & the same also confirmed by lawfull authoritie, the same Man doeth sit in Moses chaire, that is he hath right of superioritie, & authoritie, whereby he may & ought to imploie his guifts to the edifiing of all men, and all men according to their place, calling, & iust occasions may & ought to heare him /. And all that haue such guifts, ought to minister by them, & to offer

their seruice & ministerie by all occasions nether is it reprochfully to be termed stincking seruice, or vnlooked for. For we must look for good by all men, & men must offer & profer good by all occasions / ⌒.'

'But if they offer or take vpon them further then their guift or lawfull calling serueth them, being abominable men, therein their seruice stincketh, and is not blessed, nether can it be vsed /.'

'Yea your owne conscience, we are suer, will bourne & sting in you, as lyinge against the spirit of grace, if you say, that your harts haue not some tymes bene inflamed with a zeale of Gods glorie, with a conscience against synne, with a ioye in that faieth & knowledge which you haue learned & receiued at their sermons [i. e. the sermons of the "ordinarie preachers" of the Church of England] /:' . . .

'2. If anie speake against Sectaries which are none, and also in their ignorance & blind zeale seeme to raile on the innocent, they do euill. Yet except they slaunder maliciouslie, & against their conscience & knowne trueth, and it be euident, that they do it of mere zeale & by name do not spitefully abuse anie, we iudg it but an infirmitie.'

The closing words of this treatise are interesting and may well be cited. They are:—

'Thus you see, how farr you haue runn to wearie your selues in vaine /. For all this your discoursing will not proue, but that we may heare the preachers, yea by occasion, wicked preachers & false prophets, And that in all good & common graces both worldli & spiritual, we may ioine with the v[vic]ked, so that we ioine not with them in euil /.⌒.

'And the same grace, & spirit of discerning & triing, which you wish & pray for to vs, do we wish & pray for to you / & that to come from God our Father for his Christs sake.

'Wo to them that are wise in their owne eies, & prudent in their owne conceit.

'He that iustifieth the wicked & he that condemneth the righteous are both [a?] like abominable /⌒.'

Many passages could be given, if space would allow, to show that various points, which Browne in earlier years had

upheld as true, had at last been discarded by him. He now, with one or two exceptions, accepts as his own the very arguments that he had earlier opposed. If the reader will compare the views represented in the citations from Browne's earlier works with these citations from 'A reproofe . . .' and with the passage from Bredwell, he will sufficiently see the wonderful change that in a short time had come over Browne. 'A reproofe . . .' is perhaps the finest tempered, and in some respects the most interesting, treatise that he ever wrote.

Apart from the information contained in the preceding citations, the historical value of this treatise against 'Barow and Greenewood' is not insignificant.

1. This writing is evidently not that 'against one *Barowe*', referred to by Bancroft. This is of entirely different tone, and makes no reference to 'Elders and Presbyters' as that does.

2. From this treatise the writer judges that, while Browne may have appeared to Bredwell only to pretend to conformity, he honestly conformed with certain reservations, believing on the whole, under existing circumstances, that this was the wiser, as well as the safer course. If this be so, he cannot be justly blamed for inconsistency.

3. Certainly, however, Browne's conformity had its reservations[1], and he evidently never intended to allow it to become what might be termed a sleepy, easy conformity. For all he says in defence of hearing bad preachers, he admits that he sighs and grieves 'at badd doctrine, & teachers'; only he adds also, 'Do we therefore condemne the better for the worser, the good part, for the badd?'

4. After his submission Browne must really have spent a very considerable amount of time hearing various preachers of the Church of England, and in studying the subjects of

[1] That Browne openly and honestly avowed certain reservations in his conformity is proved beyond a doubt by his subscription in accepting the mastership of St. Olave's Grammar School, in which he definitely states in his own handwriting after his signature, that he makes these promises with the 'distinctions & exceptions' named 'before all the gouernours'. Probably Browne's previous subscription on October 7, 1585, was also signed with similar reservations, but of course Bredwell does not mention them.

their sermons. This study seems to have persuaded him that perhaps formerly he had been too severe in his judgements, and that at any rate it was proper, nay even might be a duty, to hear these preachers so long as they continued to preach against abuses, as they were doing when he heard them.

5. The fine, kindly, sane tone manifested throughout this long treatise shows conclusively that Browne was no insane person at the very time when Bredwell wrote of him, 'Browne is sound, his braine is sicke.' With the discovery of this manuscript the theory of Browne's later insanity must fall.

6. But after all, perhaps, the most important part that the discovery of this treatise will enable the writer to perform, is in the direction of adding a few touches to the portrait of Robert Browne as we now have it. What a flood of light this long-lost manuscript throws upon those formerly little understood years between his submission and the writing of 'A New Years Guift', December 31, 1588/9! What years of anxiety and unending controversy, as a climax to many[1] imprisonments! Yet with all this gloomy background, how striking is it to find him writing this 'Booke', probably during the first half of the year 1588, in so comparatively peaceful style, on the whole in so fair-tempered, even kindly mood! He has evidently regained some of his earlier buoyancy of spirit; his mind seems to be in an entirely healthy state; his powers in debate are nowhere seen to better advantage. Here evidently we find the conforming Robert Browne at his best. Nevertheless, it is certainly a much-changed, though probably wiser character, who looks out at us from the worn, hastily written pages of this old manuscript, as compared with the turbulent separatist Browne of former years. Here we find him defending his new and somewhat strange position with much of his earlier ardour, and with the apparent consciousness that here too he is still the master of the situation.

Two other manuscripts Browne wrote in this controversy with Barrowe and Greenwood, which are no longer extant. One of these was evidently a sort of appendix to 'A reproofe . . .', being a 'profession of our faieth in a seueral booke

[1] See 'A New Years Guift', Memorial Hall, London, E.C., 1904, p. 27.

annexed to this [i.e. 'A reproofe, . . .'] / against disorders & teaching the true doctrine of religion[1]/: which is the same our preachers do preach, and shew to the world.'

About this time Henry Barrowe (?) apparently wrote a treatise, entitled 'Four Causes of Separation'.[2] This probably was not addressed especially to Browne, but rather to all who were content to remain in the Church of England. This treatise contained those well-known words ascribed to Barrowe: 'you shall find herbye christ Jesus denied in all his ofices, & so consequently not to be com in the flesh.' The Rev. T. G. Crippen is the fortunate discoverer of a copy of this most valuable manuscript[3], written in an anonymous contemporary hand. It would seem that this treatise was originally penned in the summer or autumn of 1588, and was soon after answered by Robert Browne 'in a treatise of his against one *Barowe*', of the contents of which we now have no knowledge except in those racy lines cited by Richard Bancroft, in 'A Sermon preached at Pavles Crosse the 9. of Februarie'[4], . . . 1588/9:—

'Whereas you charge us . . . in denieng Christ in his offices, and consequently not to be come in the flesh: it shall appeere by your presbyterie or eldermen, that indeed you are and will be the aldermen even to pull the most ancient of all, Christ Iesu himselfe by the beard: yea and seeke not onely to shake him by the lockes of his haire out of his offices, but also all his ancients under him, I meane the lawful magistrates and ministers, which have lawfull authoritie from him.

'Wherefore not we but you rather seeke the glistering blase of great name: and if once you might get up the names of Elders and Presbyters, what mischiefe, crueltie, and pride would not

[1] In the manuscript the words 'against . . . religion' have been crossed out.

[2] For some account of this work, see the 'Transactions' of the Congregational Historical Society, vol. ii, no. 3, for September, 1905, pp. 149–150, and for the complete text see the 'Transactions', vol. ii, no. 4, for January, 1906.

[3] In the Congregational Library, London.

[4] See the edition published at London, and dated 1588, pp. 76–7.

streame from that name, even as fire from a blasing star to set on fire the whole world? For every busie foole, the more busie he were in discrediting others, and seeking mastership among the people, the better elder he should be judged. Yea and this new name of an elder given him, were even as a sacrament of grace, and would seale up all his knaverie: that whatsoever filthines dropped from him, yet the skirte of his ancients gowne should cover it.'

About this same time also Browne seems to have written 'a seueral treatisse in latine, touching the herring fishes . . . taken in the east seas', an apocalyptical writing and evidently the outgrowth of correspondence on that subject. In 'A New Years Guift'[1] he gives some description of this treatise, which itself probably has long since been destroyed. While what Browne says about this work and certain points in the Book of Revelation appears at first sight to indicate a mind slightly disordered, it affords no conclusive evidence that this was the case. The men of Browne's day and until late in the seventeenth century treated such matters in their discussions in dead earnest; and the ideas of that period were so vastly different from those of our time, that one is likely now to read into these early writings characteristics that were not apparent to contemporaries.

On December 31, 1588/9, Browne wrote to a Mr. — Flower, whom he calls uncle, a letter treatise, which Richard Bancroft, later Archbishop of Canterbury, secured along with 'a treatise . . . against one *Barowe*'. Sections from both of these manuscripts were employed by Bancroft in his famous sermon preached at 'Pavles Crosse'. The former treatise was discovered by the present writer in the autumn of 1902, and somewhat over a year later was published with the title 'A New Years Guift'.[2] This writing, with 'a treatise . . .

[1] pp. 35–6 of the edition published by the Congregational Historical Society, Memorial Hall, London, 1904.

[2] After the publication of 'A New Years Guift' Sir Edward Maunde Thompson kindly called the attention of the writer to the fact that this manuscript somehow came into the hands of the Rev. George Harbin (Nonjuror, Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely, 1684–1691, and Librarian at Longleate, Warminster), and became a part of his own library; that

against one *Barowe*', manifests an interesting change now to be noticed in Browne's views. Once he had strongly inclined to Presbyterianism, and hitherto he had written little against it, but now he even goes so far as to compare Presbyterianism unfavourably with the Church of England, and declares himself on the side of the latter. He tells of the bitter experiences he has had at the hands of Puritan preachers, and says that they have done him more harm than any of the bishops. He has already 'bene in more then twentie prisons', and is 'pore enough & broken to to [*sic*] much with former troubles' to feel any 'need of further affliction'.[1] The practical experiences of life had blasted his early hopes, and it is hardly surprising to us soon to find him seeking the favour of the Church of England, which he had once so heartily rejected.

Evidently Bredwell's second book, 'THE RASING | *OF THE FOVNDATIONS* | of Brovvnisme. | '..., London, 1588, was published in the autumn of that year, and its appearance may have compelled Browne's early removal from St. Olave's. Whether he was still schoolmaster when he wrote 'a treatise ... against one *Barowe*' and 'A New Years Guift' is not known, but possibly Mr. — Flower's request to answer certain questions which resulted in the writing of 'A New Years Guift' may have been prompted by the appearance of Bredwell's work.

Baillie says that Robert Browne was 'first a Schoolmaster in *Southwark*, and then a Preacher at *Islington* neer *London*,'[2] ... If he ever preached in a gravel-pit[3] there, or in the 'Saw-pit' at Chelmsford[4], therefore he would seem to have done so during his schoolmastership or at any rate probably before June 20, 1589. That Browne was ever 'Lecturer' of

Mr. Harbin's collection was sold by auction at Messrs. Puttick & Simpson's during a three days' sale in 1874; and that on the second day of the sale, Tuesday, March 31, this manuscript, together with the other items in the same bundle, was sold to the British Museum for the trifling sum of six shillings!

[1] In 'A New Years Guift', p. 43.

[2] 'A Dissvasive'... London, 1645, p. 13.

[3] Dr. Dexter's 'Congregationalism', p. 65.

[4] 'Mercurius Rusticus': ..., 1646, pp. 169–170.

St. Mary's Parish, Islington, as claimed by Lewis[1], seems rather improbable, but possible.

Certainly by June 20, 1589, Browne's school-teaching in Southwark had ended, for on that day presumably he started[2] for Peterborough to seek office in the Church of England. This time he carried with him a letter from Lord Burghley to the Bishop, requesting, 'if happelie any conceipt maie be in *you* that theare should remaine anie Reliques in him of his former erronious opinions, *your* L. would conferre *with* him and finding him duetifull and conformable as I hope you shall, to receaue him againe into the Ministerye, and to geue him *your* best meanes and helpe for sum eccl[es]iasticall prefe[r]-ment:'[2] . . .

This request of Burghley's appears to have resulted in no very prompt compliance on the part of the Bishop, probably because he found Browne not so thoroughly 'conformable' as Burghley had hoped. At any rate Browne seems, after having given up his schoolmastership, and after having interviewed the Bishop, to have returned once more to Stamford. Here evidently he gave his thought chiefly to educational matters, and probably early in 1589/90 sent Burghley certain 'latine tables and definitions' (now lost), which were later submitted to the approval of 'some learned & reuerend Fathers the Byshops', but which had been by them 'ether neglected or through greater busines forgotten'. This neglect was not resented by Browne; he kept steadily at work, and by April 15, 1590, had produced another kindred 'treatisse' concerning 'the arts & the rules & termes of Art'. This work, a sort of supplement to the 'latine tables' . . ., also has disappeared, but the letter, which was sent to Burghley with the treatise, is still extant[3], and gives us fortunately some idea of the contents of 'this book', in which he says:—

[1] See Dr. Dexter's 'The Congregationalism' . . . London ed., p. 65, note 23.

[2] Lansdowne MS. 103 (no. 60). This letter indicates that Browne himself was to carry it.

[3] Lansdowne MS. 64 (no. 34) in the British Museum.

John Strype gives this letter in full in 'The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, D.D.' See the Oxford Edition, 1822, vol. iii, pp. 229-30. From

'I haue iustly altered the arts & the rules & termes of Art, by euidence of the word, & haue corrected manie errors of all our professors, yea manie falsified points of learning both in the methode & trueth of the arts & also of religion. . . . Further I offer to proue that the word of God doth expressely sett downe, all necessarie & general rules of the arts & all learning, as may appeare by this book;' . . .

Browne's educational scheme propounded to the Lord Treasurer, at first sight seems in places to be written by one not quite in his right mind, and yet it does not necessarily appear so when read in the light cast upon his meaning by the contents of '*A Treatise vpon the* 23. *of Mat*|thewe'. . . , which though fantastical is yet quite sane. Browne himself is certainly not afraid of his abilities nor too modest in his claims:—

'yea I dare by Gods Help & your Lordships fauour vndertake this plea or cause, that in one yeare, schollers may well learne together those arts, which scarcely in ten yeares they vntowardly learne in the vniuersities/. And that by diuine wisdome & prudence they shal confute their Logick, by right speach and languag disproue their Grammar By right vse of prouerbs & prouerbial speaches or bywords disproue their Rhetorick. Allso their Arithmetick by the right rules of numbering/, their geometrie by better measuring Their Musick by better melodie, Their metaphysicks by the lawes of creation, couenaunt, and sanctification/. Their Ethicks, Aeconomicks, politicks, by true Religion & righteousnes. / yet I condemn none of the arts, but onely the falsifiing of them/: And if it were not that I am become odious to manie for the trueths sake, I would not doubt by Gods grace, to bring manie thousands of my mind & iudgment, & in verie short tyme profit them in the former studies, as is aboue specified.

a study of this Dr. Dexter came to champion the theory that Browne was becoming insane, but probably our sympathies for him cause us to read into this letter more than is really there. That Bredwell said 'his braine is sicke', or that others said he was 'madde', means little. The writer himself has heard a clergyman of the Church of England call a prominent Nonconformist minister 'mad', meaning apparently just what Browne's opponents meant by these expressions, when applied to him.

I meane if I were authorised to read publique lectures & make profession according. For as Plato, Aristotle, Socrates & Pythageras made manie thousands schollers [*sic*], and that without anie publique mantenance & charge & in verie few yeares, so much rather in the arts & points of religion more truelie handled, & vtterly differing from them all, I would hope by your Lordships good countenance onely, to performe much rather the like, & that in all quietnes also, not medling to condemne or controule anie learned man or anie kind of profession/.'

This letter is at present the latest known writing of Browne's of which we possess any knowledge, except the entries made by him in the Achurch register. His request to be allowed to teach on these new lines suggested by him does not seem to have met with any great encouragement from his noble relative or from the Bishops, in fact we do not know what reply he received. He does not, however, appear to have been idle while waiting for an opening to teach, for in Richard Cosin's little quarto volume entitled, 'CONSPIRACIE, | for Pretended Reformation: | ' . . . , the writing of which was apparently finished on the last of September, 1591, and which was published at London in 1592, it is stated (p. 32) that Giles Wigginton had two pamphlets ('the one of *Prædestination*, the other carrying an odde and needelesse title,' namely, '*The Fooles bolte*') privately printed at 'Whitsontide', 1591, 'by the meanes and helpe of one *Browne*.' This was no doubt our Robert Browne, and it will be remembered that Wigginton 'was borne or bred vp in *Oundel*', which is not far distant from Browne's home, and possibly may be the place where he first taught school after leaving college. Robert Browne was evidently not yet so consistent a conformist, that he would not aid the cause of Nonconformity in which he had formerly been so active. The discovery of Browne's complicity in the printing of Wigginton's pamphlets curiously, however, does not seem to have kept him from securing a position, for Mr. Cater has discovered a Latin entry in the '*Institution Book* among the Peterborough diocesan records', which states that on 'the thirtieth day of June, Anno Domini 1591, Robert Browne, clerk, was admitted and insti-

tuted to the rectory of the ecclesiastical parish of Little Casterton in the county of Rutland and diocese of Peterborough', &c.[1] Mr. Cater adds that the 'patron of Little Casterton was Francis Browne, Robert's eldest brother, and the occupant of Tolethorpe Hall at that time', and that the 'entry is incomplete, for there is no signature, an unusual omission.'[2]

For some unknown reason Browne did not long remain rector of Little Casterton, but on September 2, 1591, became 'rector of the parish of Achurch-cum-Thorpe Waterville, in Northamptonshire',[3] while in the following November his elder brother Philip was instituted rector of Little Casterton. Browne at last had evidently become wearied of the continual criticism to which his views in the past had subjected him, and probably had honestly come to feel that he might be of really more service to the world, as it was, not by wearing himself out by combating established ideas, but rather by accepting what the world offered him and by using the advantage he had thus gained to the furtherance of his higher ideals. However this be, Mr. Cater has been fortunate enough also to discover the following record of Browne's ordination:— 'On the last day of September, 1591, Robert Browne Bachelor in [of] Arts of Corpus Christi Cambridge was admitted to the holy orders of deacon and priest.'[4] It is from this entry that Mr. Cater has been able to prove finally that hitherto Browne had not been ordained.

[1] See 'New Facts relating to Robert Browne', by the Rev. F. Ives Cater of Oundle, in the 'Transactions' of the Congregational Historical Society, vol. ii, pp. 240–1.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 241.

[4] Ibid. The record itself is in Latin. The very fact that Browne was ordained at this time gives further evidence that he was not insane or becoming insane.

II. The Forty-two Years of Silence, including the Long Term of Excommunication

(Sept. 30, 1591—Oct. 8, 1633).

At last then we find Browne safely sheltered in that haven of rest, even Episcopal ordination, towards which his family, the Puritans, Lord Burghley, the Archbishop and Bishops had been gradually but unceasingly driving him for a period of ten long years. Nor does it seem strange that after such a struggle he was brought to take this last step, for he had practically no choice in the matter. To live as the authorities had compelled him to live in the past had benefited no one, least of all himself. He had only suffered[1] greatly for his conscientiousness, and also had 'become odious to manie for the trueths sake'.[2] He had further apparently sacrificed his life to no purpose.

Now by his ordination Robert Browne, so to speak, began a new life, but from this time the mystery about him deepens. We cannot understand him as in those earlier years, for we do not know enough about him. Bredwell's last book remained unanswered, and though Browne lived for over forty years after his ordination, his voice is silent, and we, who look back at him through the hazy mists of three hundred years, must instinctively and sorrowfully feel that by 1591 his career in reality had practically ended, and that his star had already set. Before that date, in spite of the obstacles that beset him, Browne was after all reckoned of some account, later he was almost entirely forgotten by the rude world. He wrote no more, and but few wrote about him until after his death, and since his day other than recent historians have largely taken delight in telling his story to show off his character to the least advantage, and would have been glad to make his name a byword in English Church History.

[1] 'The Rasing of the Fovndations of Brovvnisme.' . . ., 1588, p. 133.

[2] Lansdowne MS. 64 (No. 34) in the British Museum.

To all practical intents and purposes then Robert Browne's public career ended on the last of September, 1591. Probably he did his best in this new position, and he may even have been of some real value to the community at Achurch. Mr. Cater, who has made a thorough study of this period of Browne's life, says that he 'appears to have employed preachers or curates during the whole of his incumbency. . . . Whether Browne himself preached from the pulpit of Achurch or not we cannot positively say. Probably he did not'.[1] Browne's first wife, Alice Allen, was buried during this period on July 9, 1610.

From 1616 to 1626 Browne's handwriting in the Achurch register disappears, and all writers thus far have been much puzzled to know what he was doing all the while. Dr. Dexter thought that at this time 'his malady ['mental disease'] was so severe upon him that he was either housed at home, or in some safe retreat'[2]; the Rev. T. G. Crippen thinks he was 'secluded or incapable'[3], without, however, apparently realizing how near the truth the former of these suppositions probably comes; the Rev. F. Ives Cater too optimistically believes that during these years he 'gave up even those few official duties he had hitherto discharged as rector, that he might give exclusive ministerial oversight to a Brownist congregation he had formed at Thorpe Waterville, in his own parish'[4], and which met in his thatched house, called even to-day 'The Old Chapel' or 'The Chapel House'. Mr. Cater gives an extended and excellent account of this old building and of the great room in which the 'Chapel' services were held, and states that the house until recently 'bore the date 1618 on its chimney'—which date, he says in another place[5],

[1] 'New Facts . . .', 'Transactions' of the Congregational Historical Society, vol. ii, pp. 242–3.

[2] 'The Congregationalism' . . ., p. 123.

[3] In the Introduction to his reprint of 'A Treatise of Reformation' . . ., p. 10.

[4] 'New Facts' . . ., p. 243.

[5] 'Robert Browne's Ancestors and Descendants,' in the 'Transactions' of the Congregational Historical Society, vol. ii, p. 159.

synchronizes with that of Browne's second marriage (i. e. with 'Joane' Story, in All Saints, Stamford, Nov. 24, 1618).

With these views before us and with Dr. Thomas Bayly's story of Robert Browne's excommunication (in the preface to '*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ: . . .*,' 1709) in mind, it seems possible for us to reach a still more satisfactory conclusion with regard to this disappearance of Browne's handwriting from the Achurch register during the years 1616–1626. Now admittedly this excommunication story was first published at least some eighty years after the event described, and nearly one hundred years afterwards if the present writer's opinion is correct. Further, our information touching it was only orally transmitted by Dr. Bayly to 'a Grave and Reverend Divine now [1709] alive', who in turn told it to the editor of '*Bibliotheca*'; and in that work 'The Story' is only given 'in short'. Hence we may not expect either absolute accuracy or fullness of detail in the account in '*Bibliotheca*'; but nevertheless we may expect to find a kernel of truth in it. Among other things too we may safely infer that in his account the editor, in order to be exact, should have written 'Achurch near Northampton' for 'Northampton'; that the bishop who excommunicated Browne was not Lindsell but Thomas Dove, who was Bishop of Peterborough from 1601 to 1630; and that Dr. Bayly indeed *heard* this excommunication story while he was '*Chaplain to Bishop* Lindsell, *at* Peterborough', but that the event itself occurred some years earlier.

The facts of the case as they appear to the writer after considerable study seem to be as follows:—Robert Browne, possibly following the example of Richard Bernard at Worksop a few years earlier, may (as has been suggested to the writer by Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet) have formed a special covenanted company within his parish, some members at least of which may early have manifested separatist tendencies, while Browne himself was anxious to continue to conform. Possibly hearing of these schismatics in Browne's parish at Achurch near 'North-Hampton', Bishop Dove some time about June, 1616, 'cited him to appear before him; but

he neglecting, or refusing to appear, the Bishop, upon mature Deliberation, excommunicated him.'[1]

After having been excommunicated, Browne may have again repaired to Stamford, where on Nov. 24, 1618, his second marriage took place. After this he appears to have returned to the neighbourhood of Achurch, and to have built at Thorpe Waterville his thatched house, with an addition known as the 'Old Chapel', where for some years he probably taught those of his parishioners in special religious covenant with him.

No doubt the latter half of Robert Browne's life was much embittered by the way in which the world had used him. He probably withdrew into himself more and more as the years wore on. He easily became irritated, manifested 'an imperious nature', and appeared 'offended, if what he affirm'd, but in common discourse, were not instantly received as an oracle'.[2] Robert Baillie,[3] indeed, would have us believe that Browne was a confirmed 'beater of his poor old wife'. But as Fuller, who knew him personally, and also of course was well acquainted with what Baillie had written, does not even refer to any unkindness of Browne's towards his wife,

[1] This view it will be noted agrees very well with the tradition which Mr. Cater says still is told by 'the older inhabitants' of Thorpe Waterville, and the importance of which even Mr. Cater seems rather to have overlooked; to the effect, 'that a parson of Achurch was turned out, built this chapel house, held services there, and ended his days in gaol' ('Transactions' of the Congregational Historical Society for Jan., 1906, p. 244). This view also furnishes a ready solution of the problem as to the meaning of the hitherto misunderstood 'schism' entries in the Achurch register.

[2] Thomas Fuller's 'Church-History . . .', 1655, p. 168.

[3] In 'A Dissvasive . . .', 1645, Baillie says of Browne: 'The course of his life, to his deep old age, was so extreamly scandalous, that more then ordinary charity is needfull to perswade that ever he was led with a good spirit. I have heard it from reverend Ministers, that he was a common beater of his poor old wife, and would not stick to defend publikely this his wicked practice; also, that he was an open profaner of the Sabbath; and that his injustice, in not paying the small pittance he was indebted to him whom lazinesse in his Calling made him to keep for the supply of the cure of his Parsonage, did bring him to prison, in the which, for that very cause, he continued till death.' (p. 14.)

we also shall doubtless be fully justified in attaching no great importance to this statement of Baillie's, which was probably written and published with no good intent. If Browne was not so strict in his Sabbatarian views as some later and 'preciser *Brownists*', it was certainly no great discredit to him. His second wife died after a few years and was buried on Jan. 3, 1623/4, in Stamford. About two years later Browne seems to have 'submitted himself to the Bishop' of Peterborough, and to have 'desir'd to be absolv'd' of his excommunication, 'and being absolv'd accordingly, and re-admitted into the Church', he 'never after left it', but resumed[1] his duties at Achurch. From this time, during the rest of his life as a parish clergyman, he seems with the aid of curates or preachers to have done his work faithfully. His last entry in the Achurch register bears the date June 2, 1631,[2] and in November, 1633, a new rector took his place,—a fact that causes us to infer that Browne died not long before that date.

The story of Browne's death, as given by Thomas Fuller (who was born at Aldwinkle, 'within a mile of this *Brown* his pastorall charge,' at Achurch, who 'when a youth, often beheld him', and who states that he is 'credibly informed' concerning Browne's death), is as follows:—'being by the Constable of the Parish (who chanced also to be his God-son [i.e. 'Robert Greene']) somewhat roughly and rudely required the payment of a *rate*, he [Browne] happ'ned in passion to strike him. The Constable (not taking it patiently as a castagation from a God-father, but in anger as an affront to his office) complained to S^r^. *Rowland* S^t^. *John*, a neighbouring Justice of the peace, and *Brown* is brought before him. The Knight of himself, was prone rather to pity, and pardon,

[1] Browne's resumption of his duties at Achurch may indicate that during the years 1616–1626 he had had a bitter experience with some at least of his separatist gathering, which led him now to abandon separatism for ever and make the six 'schism' entries in the parish register between 1629 and 1631.

[2] See Dr. Dexter's 'The Congregationalism of the last three hundred Years, . . .', London, p. 83, note 98.

than punish his passion; but *Browns* behaviour was so stubborn, that he appeared obstinately ambitious of a prison, as desirous (after long absence) to renew his familiarity[1] with his ancient acquaintance. His *Mittimus* is made, and a cart with a feather-bed provided to carry him, he himself being so [i.e. too] infirme (above eighty) to goe, too unweldie to ride, and no friend so favourable, as to purchase for him a more comly conveyance. To *Northampton* jayle he is sent, where, soon after he sickned, died, and was buried in a neighbouring Church-yard,'[2] i.e. in St. Giles, Northampton, on October 8, 1633.[3]

Such was the lonely end of the life of Robert Browne, father of Congregationalism, whom even Dr. Dexter with all his fairness of judgement could only describe as 'a long maligned, eccentric, infirm, and probably insane, yet I must think a mainly good and singularly clever, man'.[4] And

[1] This narrative is told in Fuller's characteristically facetious and quaintly loquacious style.

[2] Thomas Fuller's 'Church-History of Britain; . . .', London, 1655, Book ix, pp. 168–9.

[3] The Rev. T. G. Crippen has kindly called the writer's attention to a note of Mr. H. N. Dixon's in the 'Transactions' of the Congregational Historical Society (vol. i, p. 421), where the date of Browne's interment and the location of his grave are recorded. Mr. Dixon here states that in the first existing volume of the parish register of St. Giles, Northampton, under the year 1633, occurs the following entry:—'Mr. Browne, Parson of Achurch, was buryed the viii. of October.'

As has been suggested to the writer by the Rev. T. G. Crippen and Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet, independently, it is improbable that Browne remained in '*Northampton* jayle' from June, 1631, to October, 1633. Fuller's account would seem to indicate that Browne was not long in gaol, but that he soon became ill and died a prisoner. It is further sufficiently evident from his burial that he died in Northampton. If then we suppose that Browne was brought thither in the spring or summer of 1633, and that he died after the lapse of a few months, we may possibly be nearer the truth, than if we suppose his imprisonment began about June, 1631, and lasted for over two years; but it must be admitted that if this view be accepted the cause of Browne's making no more entries in the Achurch register after June 2, 1631, remains a mystery.

[4] 'The Congregationalism of the last three hundred Years, . . .', N. Y., 1880, Introduction, p. viii.

indeed it must be admitted that Robert Browne will never influence men so much by the example of his life regarded as a whole, as by his courageous spirit, his love of the truth, his willingness to search for it even to his own great personal disadvantage, and especially by the writings of his early manhood—writings which, even among those who do not at all agree with his ideas, should for ever preserve the memory of his name.

A LIST OF

THE WRITINGS OF ROBERT BROWNE

chronologically arranged.

1. [A lost MS. relating to Separation, mentioned in 'A Trve and Short Declaration', and probably written early in 1581.]
2. [A lost Letter sent from his prison in London to the 'Companie' in Norwich to dissuade his followers from going to Scotland. Probably written between April 21 and August 2, 1581.]
3. 'A Booke | WHICH SHEWETH . . .,' Middelbvrgh, 1582.
4. '¶ A Treatise of reformation . . .' [Middelbvrgh, 1582.]
5. '*A Treatise vpon the* 23. *of Mat-*|thewe, . . .' [Middelbvrgh, probably printed late in 1582 or early in 1583].
6. A 'Treatise . . . of the Reuelation of Saint Iohn', planned but probably not written.
7. 'A TRVE AND | SHORT DECLARATION, . . .' [Middelbvrgh (?), 1583 (?)]. Reprinted in the 'Congregationalist', London, 1882.
8. 'An answere to Mr Cartwrights Letter, . . .' [1584/5 ?] MS., printed and published at London, before October 7, 1585,
9. [Lost Letters written to his followers in London before Oct. 7, 1585, and at the request of '*M. Far.* & *M. Har.* Londoners'.]
10. [A lost MS. admitting 'reasoning by Sillogismes' for the following conference.]
11. [A lost report of a conference with *M*[r]. *E.*[dmondes ?] *and M*[r]. *F.*[ar. ?], 1585 ?]
12. ['a raging Libell,' written against Bredwell, 1586 (?). MS. now lost, but of which there were 'sundrie' copies circulated.]
13. [A lost writing concerning 'the question of communicating', 1585 or 1586 ?]

14. [A treatise of 'v. or vi. sheetes of paper' written for a 'seelie woman' confirming her in her separation, 1587 ?]
15. [Writings 'of chalenge' against Mr. Edmondes distributed at Dertford, 1587 ?, or possibly written before Nos. 10 and 11.]
16. ['the platforme', a lost MS. against Barrowe and Greenwood, 1586 ?]
17. [A lost MS. written against Barrowe and Greenwood some time before 'A reproofe', 1587 ?]
18. [A lost appendix to 'A reproofe . . .', being a 'profession of our faith . . .', 1588 ?]
19. 'A reproofe of certeine schismatical persons & their doctrine | Touching the hearing & preaching of the word | of God.' MS. of 31 folio pages, 1588 ?
20. ['a seueral treatisse in latine, touching the herring fishes . . . taken in the east seas, 1588 ? MS., lost.]
21. ['A Treatise . . . against one *Barowe*,' 1588 ? MS., lost.]
22. [A letter written to Mr. — Flower, Dec. 31, 1588/9, MS. in the British Museum, published at London, 1904, under the title 'A New Years Guift'.]
23. [A lost MS. consisting of 'latine tables and definitions', 1589/90 ?]
24. [A lost 'treatisse' concerning 'the arts & the rules & termes of Art', written before April 15, 1590.]
25. [A letter to Burghley relating to the preceding 'treatisse', written April 15, 1590. Lansdowne MS. 64 (no. 34). Printed in Strype.]

3 2044 029 880 739

MAR 12 1920

DUE MAY 24 1921

DUE JAN 10 1924

DUE JUN 14 1926

DUE MAR 5 1929

DUE APR 4 1938

MAY 24 19[illegible]

MAR 6 '53

NOV 12 '53

JAN 4 '54

FEB 3 '54

JUN 1 1978

DUE 15 NOV

3 2044 029 880 739

MAR 12 1920

DUE MAY 23 1921

DUE JAN 10 1924

DUE JUN 14 1926

DUE MAR 5 1929

DUE APR 4 1938

MAY 24 1948

MAR 6 '53

NOV 1 '53

JAN 4 '54

FEB 3 '54

JUN 1 1978

UNIV. OF NVC